

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1327375



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

3560
M2
1865
V. 2

LECTURES

EXPLANATORY OF

THE DIATESSARON,

OR

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR

JESUS CHRIST,

COLLECTED FROM THE FOUR GOSPELS,

IN THE FORM OF A CONTINUOUS NARRATIVE.

BY

JOHN DAVID MACBRIDE, D.C.L.
PRINCIPAL OF MAGDALENE HALL.

Sint castæ deliciæ meæ Scripturæ tue; nec fallar in eis, nec fallam ex eis.
Augustini Confess. xi. 3.

The Fifth Edition.

VOL. II.

OXFORD,

J. H. AND J. PARKER;
AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

1865.

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

CONTENTS.

PART V.

66. Jesus gives offence to the Pharisees by condemning their neglect of the Law of God, in order to keep their own Traditions. Matt. xv. 1—21. Mark vii. 1—23.	1
On Jewish Tradition.	3
On Christian Tradition.	5
67. He retires to the extremity of the Holy Land, where he rewards the faith of a woman of Canaan, who would take no denial, by curing her daughter. Matt. xv. 21—28. Mark vii. 21—30.	22
68. He returns through Decapolis, and cures a deaf man, who had also an impediment in his speech. Mark vii. 31—37.	24
69. He feeds four thousand men, besides women and children, with seven loaves and a few small fishes. Matt. xv. 29—39. Mark viii. 1—9.	25
70. The Pharisees and Sadducees again seek a sign from heaven. Matt. xvi. 1—4.	26
71. The disciples are warned against the Leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Matt. xvi. 5—12. Mark viii. 14—21.	ibid.
72. Jesus restores the sight of a blind man by degrees. Mark viii. 22—26.	27
73. Peter repeats his confession, that Jesus is the Messiah. Matt. xvi. 13—20. Luke ix. 18—20. On the Papal claim to Supremacy grounded on this confession.	29
74. Jesus plainly foretels his Death and Resurrection, rebukes Peter, and exhorts them all to self-denial. Matt. xvi. 21—28. Mark viii. 31—38. Luke ix. 22—27.	47
75. The Transfiguration. Matt. xvii. 1—13. Mark ix. 1—13. Luke ix. 28—36.	49
76, 77. Jesus on his descent cures a demoniac, whom his disciples were unable to dispossess. Matt. xvii. 14—21. Mark ix. 21—29. Luke ix. 37—42.	52
78. Jesus procures by a miracle the tribute-money for himself and Peter. Matt. xvii. 24—27. On the eternity of future punishment.	55
	58

79. The Apostles contend for preeminence, and are told that it can only be acquired through humility. Jesus condemns the bigotry of his disciples, warns them against causing weak believers to stumble, and by a parable teaches forgiveness. Matt. xviii. Mark ix. 30—50. Luke ix. 46—50.	57
80. Jesus sends forth the Seventy. Luke x. 1—16.	62
81. He attends the Feast of Tabernacles, and teaches in the Temple. John vii.	63
82. A woman, taken in the act of Adultery, is brought before Jesus, who declines to condemn her as a Judge, but as a Teacher admonishes her to sin no more. John viii. 1—11.	66
83. The discourse, in which Jesus declares his own existence before the birth of Abraham, is abruptly terminated by an attempt of his auditors to stone him. John viii. 12—59.	68
84. He restores the sight of a man born blind. John ix. x.	71
85. The Seventy disciples return. Luke x. 17—20.	75
86. A Lawyer is taught the extent of his duty to his neighbour, by the example of a benevolent Samaritan. Luke x. 25—37.	77
On Supererogation.	80
87. Jesus again teaches his disciples to pray, and illustrates by a parable the efficacy of persevering prayer. Luke xi. 1—13.	81
88. He makes straight on a sabbath-day a woman who had been bowed together for eighteen years. Luke xiii. 10—17.	85
89. His reply to the question, of the number that will be saved; and his declaration, that he should be put to death in Jerusalem. Luke xiii. 23—35.	86
90. Jesus dines with a Pharisee on the Sabbath, and relates the Parable of a Supper, which those who had been invited to it excused themselves from attending. Luke xiv. 1—24.	88
91. He requires his disciples to love him more than their nearest relatives, and to be ready to forsake all that they have for his sake. Luke xiv. 25—35.	91
92. The Parables of the lost Sheep, of the lost Drachma, and of the Prodigal Son. Luke xv.	92
93. The Parables of the Unjust Steward, and of the Rich Man and the Beggar. Luke xvi.	97
94. Jesus declares the power of faith, and that the most perfect obedience is due, and cannot be meritorious. Luke xvii. 1—10.	102
95. He reproves the sons of Zebedee, who wished that fire from heaven should destroy the Samaritans. Luke ix. 51—56.	103
On Toleration and Persecution.	104
96. He cleanseth at their own petition ten lepers, of whom the only grateful one was a Samaritan. Luke xvii. 11—19.	122

97. He answers the question, when the kingdom of God shall come. Luke xvii. 20—37.	125
98. The Parables of the Unjust Judge, and of the Pharisee and Publican. Luke xviii. 1—14.	126
99. Jesus is entertained at Bethany in the house of Martha. Luke x. 38—42.	128
100, 101. He attends the feast of the Dedication ; but declaring him- self and the Father to be one, the Jews attempt to stone him for blasphemy, and he is obliged to retire beyond Jordan. John x. 22—42.	129
102. He restores Lazarus to life. John xi. 1—47.	132
103. Jesus answered the question of the Pharisees concerning divorce. Matt. xix. 3—12. Mark x. 1—12.	134
104. Jesus blesses children. Matt. xix. 13, 14. Mark x. 13—16. Luke xix. 15—17.	137
105. Jesus answers a rich young man, who enquires what he is to do to inherit eternal life, and takes occasion to warn his disciples against covetousness. The Parable of the Labourers hired at different hours. Matt. xix. 16—30. xxi. 1—16. Mark x. 17—31. Luke xviii. 18—30.	ibid.
106. Jesus again foretels his own death. Matt. xx. 17—19. Mark x. 32—34. Luke xviii. 31—34.	144
107. The mother of James and John begs for them the highest place in the Redeemer's kingdom. Matt. xx. 20—28. Mark x. 35—45.	145
108. Jesus restores the sight of Bartimæus. Matt. xx. 29—34. Mark x. 46—52. Luke xviii. 35—43.	146
109. He lodges at the house of Zacchæus, and relates the Parable of the Pounds. Luke xix. 1—27.	147
On Usury.	151
110. He proceeds from Jericho to Bethany, where he is entertained in the house of Simon the Leper. Matt. xxvii. 6—13. Mark xiv. 1—9. Luke xxii. 1—6. John xi. 47—57. xii. 1—11.	153
111. Jesus, riding on an ass's colt, proceeds in triumph to the Temple, and weeps over Jerusalem. Matt. xxi. 1—17. Mark xi. 1—19. Luke xix. 28—48. John xii. 12—50.	156
112. He condemns the barren fig-tree, and once more purifies the Temple. Mark xi. 12—19. Matt. xxii. 45—48.	163
113, 114. His Discourse in the Temple with the Chief Priests, the Scribes, and the Elders. Matt. xxi. Mark xi. xii. Luke xx.	165
115. The Pharisees and Herodians, the Sadducees, and a Scribe, put cases to Jesus for his decision, which he determines without committing himself, and in return, by one question, silences the Pharisees. Matt. xxii. Mark xii. Luke xx.	169
On the Resurrection of the body.	170

116. Jesus sharply reproves the Scribes and Pharisees, and finally leaves the Temple. Matt. xxiii.	178
117. He prefers the widow's mite, because her all, to the large sums given out of their superfluity by the rich. Matt. xii. 41—44. Luke xx. 1—4.	180
118. Jesus, on leaving the Temple, foretels its destruction, and afterwards on the mount of Olives declares to four of his Apostles the signs that shall precede his second coming. Matt. xxiv. xxv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi.	181
119. Description of the day of Judgment. Matt. xxv. 31—46.	190
120. Jesus foretels that he shall be delivered up to be crucified. Matt. xxvi. 1—6.	193

PART VI.

121. The Apostles prepare the Passover. Matt. xxvi. 17. Mark xiv. 13—16. Luke xxii. 7, 8. On the mode of keeping this Feast.	194 196
122. Supper being ready, the Apostles having again contended for preeminence, their Master washes their feet as an example of humility. Matt. xxvi. 20. Luke xxii. 15—27. John xiii. 1—17.	201
123. Jesus foretels that one of the twelve shall betray him; and, on Judas's leaving the room, declares that now he is glorified. Matt. xxvi. 22—24. Luke xxii. 28—31. John xiii. 18—35.	203
124. He foretels the fall and recovery of Peter. Matt. xxvi. 31—33. Mark xiv. 30, 31. Luke xxii. 31—38. John xiii. 36—38.	211
125. He institutes the Sacrament of the Commemoration of his Death. Matt. xxvi. 26—29. Mark xiv. 23—25. Luke xx. 19, 20. Transubstantiation a modern doctrine, and not tenable. The Eucharist no sacrifice.	212 217
126, 127. His last Discourse, in which he comforts his disciples especially with the promise of the Holy Spirit. John xiv. xv. xvi.	238
128. His Prayer for himself and his people. John xvii.	245
129. Our Saviour's Agony. Matt. xxvi. 30—46. Mark xiv. 40. Luke xxii. 43—45. John xviii. 1.	257
130. Jesus is delivered up by Judas. Matt. xxvi. 47—54. Mark xiv. 41—52. Luke xxii. 48—53. John xviii. 4—16.	261
131. He is brought before Annas, who sends him immediately to Caiaphas the High Priest. Peter, as foretold, denies his Master thrice. Matt. xxvi. 58—75. Mark xiv. 66—75. Luke xxii. 59—61. John xviii. 17.	263

132. Jesus, on his Trial, adjured by the High Priest, acknowledges himself to be the Messiah, and is condemned as guilty of death. Matt. xxvi. 63—75. Mark xiv. 53—65. Luke xxii. 60—70. John xviii. 19—31.	265
Prophecies fulfilled in his Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension.	267
133. He is brought before Pontius Pilate the Governor. Matt. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii. John xviii.	270
134. Pilate, being informed that Jesus is a Galilean, sends him to Herod. Luke xxiii. 6—12.	278
135. Herod sends him back to Pilate, who seeks in vain to release him. Mark xv. 7—9.	280
136. Pilate orders Jesus to be scourged, and, after another fruitless attempt to move the pity of the people and declaring his innocence, reluctantly delivers him to the soldiers to be crucified. John xix. 1—16.	281
137. Judas returns the bribe he had received; and after declaring his Master's innocence, hangs himself in despair. Matt. xxvii. 3—10. Acts i. 18—20.	284
138. Jesus is led away to be crucified. Matt. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii.	285
139. The Crucifixion. Matt. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii. John xix.	291
140, 141. The prodigies that ensued. The body of Jesus is granted by the Governor to Joseph of Arimathæa, who deposits it in his own new tomb.	295

PART VII.

142—145. The visit of the first party of women to the sepulchre. Matt. xxvii. Mark xvi. John xx.	308
146. The Guard bear testimony before the Rulers to the fact of the Resurrection. Matt. xxviii. 12—15.	316
147. The second party of women visit the sepulchre. Luke xxiv. 1—12.	317
148. Jesus converses with two of his disciples, who are walking to Emmaus, makes himself known to them, and immediately after disappears. Luke xxiv. 13—35.	318
149. He shows himself the same evening to his Apostles, who, with the exception of Thomas, are assembled together. Luke xxiv. 36—43. John xx. 21—23.	320
150. After the interval of a week, he appears at once to all the eleven, and Thomas, who had not believed the report of the rest, now acknowledges him for his Lord and his God. Mark xvi. John xx.	322

151. Jesus shows himself on a mountain in Galilee to the disciples, and again on the shore of the lake to seven of them who had been fishing. Matt. xxviii. 16—18. John xxi. 1—24. 325
152. He instructs his Apostles, who had now returned to Jerusalem, to preach repentance and remission of sins to all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 16—18. Luke xxiv. 44—48. 336
153. The Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ into Heaven, and his sitting down there on the Right Hand of God. Mark xv. xvi. Luke xxiv. John xx. xxi. 342
- On our Lord's human character. 347

LECTURES

ON

THE DIATESSARON.

PART V.

66. *Jesus gives offence to the Pharisees by condemning their neglect of the Law of God, in order to keep their own Traditions. Matt. xv. 1—21. Mark vii. 1—23.*

OUR LORD appears, from prudence, not to have attended the Passover of this year; but the report of his miracles gave such uneasiness to the Scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem, that some of them came down to Galilee in order to observe his proceedings, and discover, if they could, matter of accusation against him. Not finding that he and his disciples broke the Law, they objected to them their neglect of the traditions. These, which are far more numerous than the written precepts, have been since committed to writing, and have been declared by modern rabbies, who make them their principal study, to be lovely above the words of the Law^a, which indeed they have virtually superseded. Jesus was asked why his disciples did not, in conformity with one of these traditions, wash their hands before meals. Instead of answering their question, he accused them of hypocrisy, applying to them the words of Isaiah, *This nation honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.* He continued, that their enforcing

^a This, and similar sayings, are cited by Whitby in his Commentary.

human ordinances, as of divine authority, rendered their very worship vain and unprofitable; for they not only did not themselves keep the commandments of God, but had explained them away, that they might observe their own traditions. To prove this serious charge, he showed how their interpretation annulled the fifth, which requires children to maintain their parents, if they need it, as well as to honour them. But according to those casuists, if a child should say to father or mother, *whatever I have that might benefit thee is Corban*, that is, a gift to God, he was not only freed from the obligation of assisting them, but was actually forbidden by this declaration, if he repented of his unnatural behaviour; and yet it appears that he was not bound (as would be the rational conclusion) to give to the Temple what he might have bestowed upon them, but might spend it in any other manner. Thus, says Chrysostom, was a double sin committed; they did not bring it to God, and yet, as if that had been their intention, they obtained, while they deprived their parents of it, credit for piety. The extant writings of comparatively modern Jews prove that the same unhappy perversion of morality has survived their polity; for they go so far as to maintain, that “a man may be so bound by vows, that he cannot without great sin do what God hath in his law required, so that in such cases the vow must stand, and the law be abrogated^b. ” Their exposition of this commandment is only given as an example, for our Lord added, *and many like things ye do.* This systematic perversion of morality which he so strongly condemned, has accompanied Israel wherever the nation has been scattered, with the exception of the Karaites, insignificant in number, who allow no authority but the written word.

^b Pococke, Miscell. p. 415.

ON JEWISH TRADITION.

Tradition, here denounced so solemnly, was encouraged and enlarged by succeeding generations, till, from an authority equal to Scripture, it became superior, and superseded it, in the reverence and affections of the people. It should be recollect, that the Pentateuch not only reveals, like the New Testament, the principles of duty to God and man, but is moreover a code of laws, for the regulation of personal, social, and political life. This code is carried out into the most minute details by the oral law, so called, because it is assumed to have been revealed to Moses, together with the other, which he was instructed to write, while this was to be communicated secretly to the authorized interpreters of the former. It is said, accordingly, to have been transmitted through Ezra and the great Sanhedrim to Rabbi Jehudah, who at last committed it to writing at the close of the second century, and the whole nation regards it as a digest of all that an Israelite is required to believe and to do. It is called the Talmud, the Doctrine, that is, whatever a believer ought to learn, and is divided into two parts; the Text called Mishna, the Repetition, and the Commentary Gemara, that is, perfection, because pronounced to be a final authoritative complete explanation of the original Law. There are two Gemaras, that of Jerusalem, supposed to be a compilation of the third century, now comparatively disregarded; and that of Babylon, a work of the sixth, which abounds in absurd and often blasphemous fables. The Mishna, with a Latin translation^c, fills six folio volumes; and the Hebrew text alone of the Gemara of Babylon^d, doubles the number! So voluminous a work, a knowledge of which the prejudices of ages have rendered indispensable to the Rabbi, must engross the greater part of his time, and accordingly the study of the

^c Amsterdam, 1698.

^d Berlin, 1715.

Bible with its Targums and Commentaries, is subordinate to that of the Talmud. Strange as it may seem to any one, however slightly acquainted with its contents, this compilation still retains its hold upon the Jewish mind; as appears from German catechisms, recently published with a view of presenting modern Judaism in the most favourable light, in which it is plainly stated, that these traditions, numerous as they are, contain no mere human ordinances, but are of equal authority with the Pentateuch. Our Saviour showed, that the Scribes of his time had virtually abrogated the fifth commandment; the Rabbis, following in their steps, have made *the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, mercy, and faith, of none effect by their tradition,* and by their casuistry have rendered probable the charge brought against their ancestors of hatred to all nations but their own. The remark may seem severe, but it is justified by the following quotations. He who sweareth to a Gentile, must pay the principal, but is not bound to add the fifth, because the Law^e prescribes this only if he lie to his neighbour, which a Gentile is not. To restore to an Israelite what he has lost, is a positive command; Thou shalt in any way bring it again to thy brother; but any article lost belonging to a Gentile, (who is not a brother,) it is lawful to keep. We are apt to wonder how any pious Israelite cannot discover in Jesus the Messiah, as delineated in the Psalms and the Prophets; but not only have the most striking passages, which the Targums, or ancient paraphrases, interpret as we do of him, been wrested to speak of others by the new School of Biblical criticism, which arose when the cruelty of the Crusaders had exasperated them; but the Old Testament itself was forsaken for the Talmud, which was more in harmony with their vitiated literary and moral taste.

^e Leviticus vi. 5.

ON CHRISTIAN TRADITION.

Such is the unhappy effect of tradition on the ancient people of God: and Christendom would have had reason to rejoice, if the Church of Rome, which still retains so large a portion of it under her dominion, taught by their example and her Lord's warning, had been a faithful "witness and keeper of holy writ." Her neglect, and afterwards studied disparagement, of God's Word, affords a copious and melancholy comment on our Saviour's declaration. This *mystery of iniquity* early began to work, but it would not have borne such bitter fruit so soon, had it not ripened under the favour of the reputed successors of St. Peter, who are mainly indebted to it for the unscriptural pretensions of their See. Its tendencies were noticed with alarm by pious Christians; and even Gregory the First, so superior to succeeding Popes, and perhaps the best that has ever presided over that Church, when comparatively pure, A.D. 590—602, seems to have had a prophetic intimation of the evil to come, when he wrote to the arrogant Patriarch of Constantinople, that whoever assumed the title of Universal Bishop, doth in his elation forerun Antichrist. His successors, ignorant or heedless of what he had written, claimed to be the fountain of ecclesiastical authority, and visible monarchs of the Church, the Vicars, that is, the representatives and substitutes of Christ. Certainly by such titles which Gregory VII. Innocent III. and Boniface VIII. suffered not to be empty names, and by corresponding decrees, the Supreme Pontiff, *as God, sitteth in the Temple of God*, and decides what is true or false, right or wrong, because he doth proudly set himself before all others. Many eminent divines of learning and cool judgment, who can never be accused of enthusiasm or bigotry, maintain, that he is Antichrist in the worse sense of an opponent; and certainly it cannot be denied, that any

one, who calmly examines his system of Theology, must confess that the truths which it retains are lowered, and practically almost neutralised, by the errors with which they are adulterated. Thus it degrades, by sharing it with his Mother and the Saints as subordinate mediators, the intercessory office of our High Priest; and Purgatory deprives the wicked of the salutary fear of Hell, and robs the believer of the hope of immediate blessedness, while the pardons and indulgences that flow from it presuppose the supererogatory merits of the Saints, which may be granted to make up the deficiencies of less worthy members of the Church; and being sold, render salvation easier to the rich than to the poor, and grants them an earlier enjoyment of heaven. Nor is this adulteration of the truth the only charge we can substantiate; for we may justly accuse of antichristian doctrine a Church, which by her creed substitutes for an external imputed justification by Faith, an inherent justification by Holiness; for repentance, penance; for a commemoration of the Saviour's death by a Minister, his sacrifice by a Priest; for his spiritual presence in the hearts of the faithful, the actual presence of his body and blood, and even his divinity, under the appearance of a wafer. This specification of errors mixed with truth, and of errors substituted for it, may appear exaggerated to those who are unacquainted with the Protestant controversy; but those who have studied it know that the catalogue might be easily enlarged; and I believe that no Roman Catholic can deny that I have fairly stated their doctrines. An examination of them does not accord with the nature of this work; but our Church has not only protested against them, but has, from its Reformation to the present day, sent forth a succession of able champions, whose works fully justify her secession from Rome. Ridley and Cranmer, who led the way, were followed by Jewel, whose celebrated Apology and Defence may be regarded as stamped with authority. The two Archbishops,

Laud and Usher, though heads of different Schools of Divinity, have both ably vindicated our common Faith, and showed that we could have “no peace with Rome, while Rome continued as it was.” The conversion of James II. revived the controversy, which was carried on by learned writers, better known to us by other works, as Tillotson, Sherlock, and Stillingfleet; and from this storehouse of Tracts, collected together into two folios by Bishop Gibson, our divines may abundantly supply themselves with the best weapons for the support of Protestant truth. Such doctrines could never have been established, if the Scriptures had been formerly as accessible as they are now to all; but the system grew up by degrees, advancing from bad to worse, not I conceive, as has been plausibly argued, as a deliberate scheme of priestcraft, though none could better promote that object than one that compels private confession to a priest, and teaches that he can, whenever he pleases, bring the Saviour down from his heavenly throne. For I believe Popery to be the natural growth of the human heart not under the influence of Grace, which contrives in different ways, and under different religions, to substitute form for substance, and to transfer religious duties as much as possible from a man’s self, to his spiritual adviser. This has been happily illustrated in a variety of ways by the present Archbishop of Dublin, in his Bampton Lectures; and I introduce from his later work of Essays on Christianity^f, a most appropriate observation. “The fact is, that in a great number of instances, (and by no means exclusively in questions connected with Religion,) the erroneous belief or practice has risen first, and the theory has been devised afterwards for its support. Into whatever opinions or conduct men are led by any human propensities, they seek to defend and justify these by the best arguments they can frame; and then assigning, as they often do in perfect sincerity, these arguments as the cause of their

^f Fourth Series, p. 199.

adopting such notions, they misdirect the course of our inquiry, and thus the chance (however small it may be at any rate) of rectifying their errors is diminished; for if these be in reality traceable to some deep-seated principle of our nature, as soon as ever one false foundation on which they have been placed is removed, another will be substituted; as soon as one theory is proved untenable, a new one will be devised in its place." This remark of the able and original Prelate, is strikingly illustrated in the conduct of the Roman Church. The errors which had grown up in dark ages, when the Bible was, except to a few even of the learned, a sealed Book, were discovered to be errors, and some of the most injurious tendency, as soon as that volume of pure Truth was opened for the perusal of all. The attempt to support them by far-fetched allegorising interpretations, was soon found to be hopeless, and therefore recourse was had to a new standard Tradition, which not merely Roman divines, like Bellarmine or Bossuet, whose authority may be disclaimed if convenient, but the Church itself, in Council assembled, has solemnly acknowledged as the unwritten Word of God, and declares that she "receives and venerates that and all the books (including the Apocrypha) of the Bible with sentiments of equal piety and reverence." Such is the Trent Decree, which Roman Catholics acknowledge is, upon their principles, infallible; for though their divines differ as to the seat of Infallibility, some placing it in a Council, and others in a Pope; they cannot consistently object to any dogma decreed by the first, and ratified by the second, in the Creed; which bears the name of Pius IV. and which every ordained Priest swears that he will hold and preach.

Tradition, the assumed equal of Scripture, first appears as its interpreter, and so brings it under *tutelage*, which is soon converted into *vassalage*^s. For as the comment

^s Bishop Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome.

claims the same divine origin as the text, it has in fact a superior authority ; since though in theory it is only equal to Scripture, in practice it becomes paramount. It is only by lowering the importance of Scripture, that Tradition can be thus exalted ; and here the infidel and papist meet in attempts to show, that it is so perplexed and ambiguous, that in many places it is unintelligible, (to use the words of Cardinal Bellarmine,) unless explained by some infallible authority. The Scripture bears testimony to itself, that *it is a lantern to our feet*; and the writer of the 119th Psalm exclaims, *I have more understanding than my teachers, I am wiser than the aged; for thy testimonies are my study, and because I keep thy commandments.* The affirmation is borne out by reason ; for surely, if God deigned to inspire men to record his will, he would take care that they should be guided into all necessary religious and moral truth ; and what we might expect, has been in every age confirmed by the experience of multitudes of moderate abilities and limited education. Interpretation, however, is the least important claim of Tradition. On many of the Articles on which Rome insists, Scripture is wholly silent, and therefore it calls in to its aid Tradition as an independent source of knowledge. To assert that the written word of God contains whatever he requires his rational creatures to know, might appear to one who had never read ecclesiastical history a truism, too obvious to need to be repeated ; and yet the three great divisions of mankind, the religions of two of which are based upon a real, and the third upon a presumed, Revelation, the Jew, the Christian, and the Mahometan, are so little satisfied with the Bible or the Koran, that they virtually concede that they are incomplete, by adding to them Traditions. But here both have a manifest advantage. The former appeals to his Talmud, the latter to the written sayings of his Prophet, traced up through well-known names to those to whom they were spoken, while there is no authorized collection of Christian

Traditions, and the believer who expects to find the Church of Rome an infallible guide, whose decision shall put "an end to controversies," will soon discover his mistake. The first of the twelve Articles which Pius IV. attached to the Nicene Creed, A.D. 1564, "admits and embraces Apostolical Traditions," but he must seek for them himself in the decrees of Councils, and in the voluminous writings of the Fathers, that is, of all the ecclesiastical authors, with a few exceptions, from the Apostolical age to the fifth century, and lower, at least, from Clement of Rome, to Jerome and Augustine. But Tradition, when thus painfully collected, is not found to answer the purpose for which it is brought forward. The earlier Fathers, like the Bible, are silent upon the peculiar doctrines of Rome; and the later, whatever may be their merits as commentators, never profess to know more than they collect from the New Testament, of the doctrines of our Saviour and his Apostles. Indeed, the early ones in their disputes with the Gnostics appeal in the manner of Protestants to the written word, as containing the whole of the religious knowledge which it had pleased God to reveal. And we should remember too, that these truths are not announced in single passages, upon the meaning of which critics might dispute, but are presented to the reader again and again in various forms. When we consider how natural it is to treasure up whatever we can remember of the conversation of those whom we love and admire, and especially if they have exercised any influence upon mankind, and that many who listened to the discourses of the Saviour and his Apostles were able to record them, it is wonderful that Tradition has so little to tell of them, whether true or false. Excluding the forged Gospels and Acts which confute themselves, I am not aware of any sayings assigned to the Apostles, and the two or three very short ones recorded of their Master are of no doctrinal importance. Rome shifted the foundation of her creed from Scripture to Tradition, when

the former failed her; but the same spirit of investigation which deprived her of the first, soon showed the insufficiency of the second. The four great doctors of the Church, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine, whose statues Bernini made support the papal Chair in St. Peter's church, never heard of the Pontiff's most pernicious tenets; they are even later than the first Gregory. "Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found;" and it may be proved of the peculiar tenets of Rome, that they were either "brought in in such an age after Christ, or in such an age were not in;" and yet the Council of Trent repeatedly declares, that the doctrines which it defines were invariably held by the Catholic Church from the beginning. Jewel, on the contrary, maintained, that the doctrines which Rome propounded as ancient, were modern innovations; and his Apology may be regarded as the accredited vindication of our own Reformed branch of it, since it was approved by four successive Archbishops of Canterbury, and Queen Elizabeth ordered a copy of it to be kept for reading in every parish church. Thus, not in a Latin treatise, which would be accessible only to a comparatively learned few, but in a Sermon in our own tongue, intelligible to all, and preached at Paul's Cross in 1560, he invited discussion. "Here the matter itself that I have now in hand putteth me in remembrance of certain things that I uttered unto you, to the same purpose at my last being in this place. I remember I laid out then here before you a number of things that are now in controversy, whereunto our adversaries will not yield. And I said, perhaps boldly, as I might then seem to some man, but as I myself, and the learned of our adversaries themselves do well know, sincerely and truly, that none of all of them, that this day stand against us, are able, or shall ever be able, to prove against us any one of all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by example of the Primitive Church, or by

the old Doctors, or by the ancient General Councils.—My promise was, and that openly before you all, that if any man were able to prove the contrary, I would yield and subscribe to him, and he should depart with the victory.—The words that I then spake, as near as I can call them to mind, were these. If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor or Father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the Primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved that there was any private Mass in the whole world at that time for the space of six hundred years after Christ, or that there was then any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind, or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not, or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal Bishop, or the head of the universal Church, or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the Sacrament, or that his body is or may be in a thousand places or more at one time, or that the priest did then hold up the Sacrament over his head, or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour, or that the Sacrament was there, or ought now to be hanged up under a canopie, or that in the Sacrament after the words of consecration there remaineth only the accidents and shows, without the substance of bread and wine, or that the priest then divided the Sacrament in three parts, and afterwards received himself all alone, or that whosoever had said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been judged for an heretic, or that it was lawful then to have xxx, xx, xv, or v, Masses said in one church, in one day, or that images were then set up in the churches to the intent the people might worship

them, or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue:—if any man alive were able to prove any of these articles by any one clear or plain cause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old Doctors, or of any old General Council, or by any example of the Primitive Church, I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him.” The Bishop proceeds in the same strain, “ Besides all that I have said already, I will say further, and yet nothing so much as might be said.” He then specifies some other innovations, concluding with these words; “ These be the highest mysteries and greatest keies of their religion, and without them their doctrine can never be maintained and stand upright. If any one of all our adversaries be able to avow any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him, and to subscribe. But I am well assured, that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence. And because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived.” None, however, has, for nearly three centuries, put forth an adequate confutation of this challenge of the champion of our faith. And the Irish Jesuit, who dared any Protestant to allege a text, that condemned some of their leading tenets, was answered by Primate Usher, whose Reply fully justified his assertion, that “ the novelty of the new Romish doctrine was therein plainly discovered.”

As the study of Ecclesiastical Antiquity advanced, the Romanists found that Tradition, even in all the latitude with which they take it, could no more than Scripture sustain the superstructure of *hay and stubble* which they had raised. Hence the ingenuity of some of their German divines, as dissatisfied with the Fathers, as their predecessors had been with Scripture, attempted to lay a new foundation, in what has acquired in our country the name of developement. The

bud which is now unfolding, was first formed at the Council of Trent, which though it had fixed the Bible and Tradition, or, as they called it, the written and unwritten word, as the only rules of faith, found it necessary, in such cases as Indulgences and Image worship, to introduce as a third rule its own authority. Thus on the Invocation of the Saints, and the Worship of their relics, no attempt is made to press Scripture into the service of the Synod, for the members of it were conscious that Scripture was against them. Even Tradition appears to be abandoned, at least Apostolical Tradition, for appeal is made only to the practice of the Apostolical Church. The sciences which teach us the properties of nature, that is, of the works of God, are human discoveries, and are gradually improved by the observations and experiments of successive generations, but Theology is a Revelation. It may be better understood, as the volume in which it is contained is more carefully and judiciously studied; but it can never be improved, being in its nature perfect and unalterable. Overlooking this essential and obvious difference, between divine and human knowledge, these theorists assume, that because we are better natural philosophers than our ancestors, Christianity was more developed in the age of the Fathers than in that of the Apostles, and was in a still more perfect state in that of the Schoolmen. This developement may answer their purpose for a season; but it is a dangerous weapon, which may recoil upon those who introduced it; for if the Romanist, by this device, improves, as Newman boldly does, Christianity into the deification of the Virgin, how can he prevent the Anti-Trinitarian from using it in an opposite direction, till he has established, as he imagines, the simple humanity of our Lord? The Protestants however, from this concession, may deduce a new argument against Rome; for if they allow, what we have always maintained, that Rome was Catholic long before it was Papal, and that the Papacy was

not developed for centuries; upon what principle can they show that it was intended that there should ever be an universal Governor of the Church, who had never been thought of in that age, in which Christianity is generally allowed to have been exhibited in its original purity? I leave the Romanist to reconcile, if he can, the four orthodox and general Councils, with the European and heretical Councils of Florence, the Lateran Palace, and Trent, Popes with Popes, and the Fathers of one age with the Fathers of another; or if he prefer to follow these new teachers, into whatever system of superstition or infidelity developement may carry them along, satisfied the more, the longer I study the subject, with Chillingworth^b, that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon the rock of Scripture; and adopting his memorable conclusion, “The Bible, I say the Bible, is the only religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as matter of faith, and of religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds, believe it themselves, or require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption.” Not that I would abuse, as some have done, the privilege of private judgment, and steer without chart or compass, when the Church, in which I was baptized and bred, has drawn out of this source of Truth *a form of sound words*, which she does not, like Rome, the self-styled “Mistress of all Churches,” command us under the penalty of curses to profess, but as a “Mother” invites us to accept. Renouncing power, rejecting tradition, and seeking not forbidding enquiry, she maintains, though he hath expressed it in other words, what Chillingworth hath borrowed from her sixth Article, that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor

^b Works, ii. p. 410. Charity maintained.

may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Romanists plead in favour of Tradition, the insufficiency as well as the obscurity of Scripture; but our opponents may be confuted from reasoning, experience, and authority. I dwell not upon the many reasons that might be urged; for if God be the Author, the contents of the Bible must be truth without any alloy of error, and all the truth that it is indispensable to know. The Articles of our Church answer the demand of experience. The only fault that the orthodox have found with them is, that they err from excess, not from deficiency; but though some may think that they have stated propositions that were not wanted, all agree that they have stated none that are false, and have omitted no essential tenets. Scripture proofs have been found for them all, and divines of different schools have substantially agreed in the interpretation of them. Experience proves that the Bible satisfies the claims of the acutest and most profound intellect; and, while it enlightens the understanding, sanctifies the heart, if read, as it ought to be, with diligent study and prayer. Our Lord's condemnation of Jewish Tradition is at least as unfavourable to Christian; and he appealed to the Law and to the Prophets as a sufficient guide. In fuller terms does his Apostle Paul declare of that smaller and obscurer portion of God's revealed will, which Timothy had *known from infancy*ⁱ, that it was *able to make the private Christian wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus*. And after enumerating its properties, as teaching, reproofing, correcting, and instructing in righteousness, he pronounces that it will perfectly educate the Christian Minister. These words of Paul, *worthy of all acceptation*, are acknowledged to be themselves Scripture by Peter^k, and if we have not the same attestation to the other books of

ⁱ Ἀπὸ βρέφους, rendered *childhood* in A. T.

^k 2 Peter iii. 16.

the New Testament, it is only because there were no other surviving believers who could put to them the seal of inspiration.

These remarks upon the nature and authority of Tradition, have necessarily alluded mainly to articles of Faith, and only indirectly show that it is subversive also of Morality. However, I cannot dismiss the subject without stating, that Roman Catholic casuists, like these Pharisees, and at least in an equal degree, *transgress the commandment of God by their tradition*. My space does not admit of proofs in detail. Were it my object to unveil that mystery of iniquity, the ethics of Rome, it would be easy to fill volumes; and to substantiate the charge of recommending crimes, and palliating sins, even such as cannot be named among Christians, by reference to admired doctors of their communion, who seem to have vied with one another in showing, from what they deem competent authority, to what a depth of wickedness a man may deliberately descend, without risking his salvation. Decency forbids a full exposure of these abominations, and few would choose to pollute their minds by a perusal of any of the bulky folios, prepared for instance by Bauny and Escobar, for the guidance of priests, who are condemned to meditate on such topics by the practice of auricular confession, that awful prolific source of corruption, both to penitent and confessor. My own knowledge is wholly obtained from the "Provinciales" of the Jansenist Pascal¹,

¹ As Romanism, in too many instances, renders the word of God of none effect by Tradition, so the Jesuits have gone much farther; and in order to recommend themselves as Confessors, have annihilated Morality by their specious doctrine of Probability, so fully exposed by Pascal. I must refer to his Letters for the proof of this fact, which, except he had quoted the very words of their casuists, could not fail to appear to be a calumny, citing only the indignant language to which he closes his conversation with the Jesuit, and briefly stating, what most of my readers are I suppose ignorant of,

that masterpiece of wit and literature of a pious genius, alike unequalled in science and eloquence, who has consigned to infamy the morality of the Jesuits, as long as the language of France shall be understood. It is urged in favour of the Order, not that these treatises on Morals have not been faithfully cited, but that it is not responsible for

the meaning of *Probability*. “Was it not enough to have allowed to men so many forbidden things, by the palliations which you have introduced, must you also give them opportunity to commit the very crimes which you have not been able to excuse, by facility and assurance of absolution, in destroying for this purpose the power of priests, and obliging them to absolve rather as slaves, than judges, even the most inveterate sinners without any change of life, without any sign of regret, except promises broken a hundred times, without penance, if they will not accept it, and without quitting situations in which they are exposed to the danger of sinning, if they should find it inconvenient. But you proceed still further, and the liberty you have taken of shaking the most sacred rules of Christian conduct, extends even to the overthrow of the law of God. You attack piety in the heart, you take from it the spirit that gives it life; you say that the love of God is not necessary to salvation, you even assert that dispensation from this love is the benefit which Jesus Christ has brought into the world! Before the Incarnation, one was obliged to love God; but since *God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son*, the world redeemed by him is discharged from this obligation. Strange theology of our days! You remove the anathema which St. Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 22.) pronounced upon all who love not the Lord Jesus Christ.” Letter x. “Probability is the foundation and a, b, c, of our morality. An opinion is probable which is formed upon reasons of weight, and even a single doctor can sometimes render an opinion probable, for a person devoted to one study would not have embraced an opinion unless drawn to it by a good and sufficient reason. There are few questions on which you will not find that one doctor speaks in the affirmative, another in the negative. The enquirer consequently chooses the opinion that is most agreeable to himself, and the confessor, though the opinion may not appear to him or even to the penitent probable, is bound, under the penalty of committing a mortal sin, to absolve him.” Letter v.

the opinions of individual members. The remark, though plausible, will have little weight with those who know how this Society, which was founded to withstand the Reformation, in addition to the Monastic triple vow, is pledged to implicit obedience to the Pope; and that from other sources the very name of Jesuit conveys to the honest Romanist, as much as to a Protestant, the idea of a dissembler, who can make vice pass for virtue, and maintains that a good end justifies assassination^m, or any other flagitious means. We

^m Both Henry III. of France, and his successor Henry IV. fell by the daggers of two fanatics, who had been educated by the Jesuits, and gloried in the act as pleasing to God. Sixteen years after, Sanctarellus, one of the Order, published at Rome 1626, with the approbation of the General, his *Tractatus de Hæresi*, in which he maintains, that the Pope, because he has supreme power, may depose Sovereigns for any crime, and even for insufficiency, and after admonition punish them by death. After the murder of Henry IV. the doctors of the Sorbonne stated to the Parliament of Paris, that works of Jesuits were circulated full of the doctrine, that those whom they called tyrants, might be lawfully killed. The ablest of these is the *Tract De Rege*, of Mariana, the celebrated historian of Spain, who derives the power of kings from the people. He discusses at length the lawfulness of putting to death a tyrant, and writes, “Henry III. lies slain by a monk nobile monumentum, insignem animi confidentiam, facinus memorabile,” by which Princes may be taught, that impious darings do not occur with impunity, for he was preparing to leave his kingdom to one who had been infected with bad opinions on religion from his tender years, and therefore devoted to hell by the Roman Pontiff, and deprived of the right of succession. A synopsis of the book may be seen in Sharon Turner’s History of Elizabeth, chapter xxxi. the result of which is, that any man may kill a tyrant. But who we may ask of acknowledged Sovereigns comes under that description? The Council of Constance, he admits, censures the doctrine, that a tyrant may be slain by treachery as well as by violence; but as this sentence was not approved by Eugenius IV. and his successors, he pays no respect to it. It is braver, he allows, to rush openly upon a tyrant, but the prudent will make use of fraud and ambush.

learn from the Canonists that Popes are above and beyond the law; and certainly they have the power of condemning works of an immoral as well as of an heretical character. But so far have they been from taking upon themselves this office, that they have sanctioned the violation of duty both in private and public life. Plenary absolution and the sale of dispensations not only from oaths and vows, but even for the commission of crimes, facts too notorious to be denied, originate in doctrines which no ingenuity could have wrested out of the written word. The punishment of presumed heresy by death, whether by open violence as inflicted on the Albigenses under the direction of St. Dominic, or as reduced to system by the Inquisition, is a dogma which has never been retracted; and Gregory XIII. may be said to have gloried in his shame, when he caused the massacre of St. Bartholomew to be commemorated in painting on the walls of the Vaticanⁿ, and struck a medal in honour of that slaughter of the Huguenots^o.

ⁿ They were painted by Vasari, the author of the Lives of the Painters; and though time has faded them more than the Frescos of Raffaelle, about half a century earlier, they are still discernible on the walls of the Sala Regia, the scene of the magnificent banquets of Leo X. which, since with the Reformation luxury and pleasure disappeared from the Papal court, is now only used for procession from the Sistine to the Paoline Chapels, with which it communicates.

^o The authenticity of this medal, marked with the legend *Hugonottorum Strages*, has been denied by liberal Roman Catholics, who were imperfectly acquainted with the history and claims of their Pontiffs; but an engraving of it may be seen in the *Numismata Pontificum Romanorum*, by the Jesuit Bonanni, Romæ 1699, tom. ii. p. 336. and so far is he from wishing to soften down this massacre, which he himself calls lanienam horribilem, that he informs us that the Pope wrote to Charles IX. characterised by this author as a boy of generous disposition, that he should proceed with resolution, and not by mixing milder measures, ruin a cause so prosperously begun with sharp remedies. He adds, that in order to show that the

Their Bulls, anathematising and deposing Sovereigns, from the Emperor Henry IV. to our Queen Elizabeth, and Henry IV. King of France, A.D. 1076—1585, must be known to every reader of history; and Bellarmine informs us, that such may be murdered by their subjects or any others whatsoever, without guilt. Pius V. in excommunicating Elizabeth, and all who adhered to her, expressly absolves her subjects from their allegiance; and the preamble of his Bull, in which he claims the right of plucking up and of pulling down, as well as of planting and of building, affords a singular contrast to the reproof of him whose representative he assumes to be; *The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.* Some tell us, that the Popes of a more liberal age silently reject the decrees of their predecessors, though they cannot in consequence of their claim to infallibility annul them; yet as if to show how little foundation there is for this charitable conclusion, and that Rome is *ever the same*, after an interval of nearly a century and a half, when indignation against the Reformation might be supposed to have subsided, it pleased Clement XI. to select out of the long catalogue this very Pontiff for an object of worship, and to place the faithful under the protection of this new saint, whom God, we are told in the Collect for his day, has vouchsafed to choose, both to restore divine service, and to *crush* the enemies of the Church^p.

slaughter was not perpetrated without God's aid and the Divine counsel, Gregory struck on the reverse an Angel, who rushes armed with a sword and a cross, on the rebels.

^p Ad conterendos Ecclesiae tuae hostes, is correctly rendered *crush* in the translation of this Collect, in the Ordinary of the Mass, published by Coghlan, London 1799; but softened down (as has been already observed of "*impera*" in a hymn addressed to the Virgin) to *depress* in the Roman Missal, for the use of the laity. Keating, London 1815.

Such observations as these, which might have been greatly extended, show the consequences, both under the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, of any departure from the written word which God has provided for the guidance of individuals and communities, and ought to excite our gratitude for his providential care, which has raised up for us such a bulwark of divine truth, against errors of faith and practice in a reformed Church, which so decidedly maintains the supremacy of Scripture.

Jesus then called the people to him, and said, *Hearken unto me every one of you, and understand;* and told them in plain terms, that a man was defiled, not by what entered into the mouth, but by what came out of it, that is, by evil thoughts, which produce wicked actions. Peter afterwards, when he was alone with his disciples, asked him the meaning of this saying, and he told him that he spake of words which betray the thoughts and desires that prevail within. We are surprised at his dulness, but we forget, that the explanation, which has been familiar to us from childhood, was then new; and that the Jews, who rested satisfied in the performance of outward ablutions, had no conception that they were appointed only to remind them of the importance of inward purity.

67. *He retires to the extremity of the Holy Land, where he rewards the faith of a woman of Canaan, who would take no denial, by curing her daughter. Matt. xv. 21—28. Mark vii. 24—30.*

After this offence publicly given to the Pharisees, Jesus retired to the most remote northern extremity of the land, on the confines of Tyre and Sidon, the population of which was chiefly Gentile, where, if his enemies were disposed to follow him, he might place himself under Philip's protection. He entered into an house, with the intention of remaining unknown; but this could not be, for his fame as a miraculous

healer of diseases, had reached Syria before him. But now he seemed to refuse to act; for a woman, descended from the ancient Canaanites, besought him in vain to release her daughter from demoniacal possession. She is also called a Greek, that is, an idolater, which, by owning herself to be justly treated as a dog, she appears to have still been, although she addressed Jesus as the Son of David; a title she might have learnt to use without an adequate conception of its meaning. He heard her in silence, with apparent indifference yet real kindness, intending thereby to prove and manifest the strength of her faith. The Apostles, pitying her distress, or wearied with her importunity, requested him to grant her petition; but he replied, in her hearing, that he was sent to none but the lost sheep of the house of Israel. This speech was so far from offending or discouraging her, that she pleaded the more earnestly, throwing herself at his feet. Still he repelled her in harsher terms, telling her that it was not meet *to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs*, that is, to bestow upon the heathen the blessings intended for Israel. Nevertheless, she persevered, and instead of disdaining the comparison of her to a dog, and withdrawing in indignation, meekly submitted to the mortifying distinction, which by a happy ingenuity she even turned into an argument for granting her petition. Her reply was equivalent to a confession, that the heathen are no better than dogs in comparison of the children the Jews, yet as such, notwithstanding their inferiority, they are still a part of thy household: and as the dogs eat of the fragments of a plentiful table, without any detriment to the children, so the power of Jesus is so great, that he can heal her daughter without any diminution of the blessings reserved for Israel. Our Lord's purpose being now answered, he granted her request, in language which, while it commanded and encouraged perseverance, conveyed reproof to many Israelites. *Great is thy faith, be it unto*

thee as thou wilt. Like Jacob, she wrestled with God in prayer, and prevailed; and thus learnt, and has taught others, *to pray and not to faint*, since God will be found in the end *a Hearer of prayer, though he may bear long with his elect.*

68. *He returns through Decapolis, and cures a deaf man, who had also an impediment in his speech. Mark vii. 31—37.*

The notoriety of the miracle, which had been conceded to the importunity of maternal affection, interfered with our Lord's desire of privacy, and seems to have been the cause of his returning immediately homeward through Decapolis, the district in which the dispossessed demoniac of the tombs had declared, by his order, the great things that he had done for him. It is probable that the different reception which Jesus now found was owing to his report; for then they besought him to leave them, now they brought to be cured the diseased, the blind, and the lame. The case is specified of a deaf man with an impediment in his speech. Taking him aside out of the crowd, he restored him to the perfect use of both senses, but signified his intentions, as in other instances, not by words, which a deaf man could not have understood, but by an application to the defective organs. *He put his fingers into his ears, and he spat, and touched his tongue.* At the same time he looked up to Heaven, to direct him to the Giver of speech and hearing, saying, *be opened*, and sighed, probably at the amount of misery which it was incompatible with the scheme of the moral government of the world for him to relieve. In this district there were no Pharisees to pervert and mislead, and therefore the spectators gave way to the feelings of astonishment and admiration, that such an exhibition of power and benevolence was calculated to call forth. They exclaimed, *He hath done all things well, he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.*

69. *He feeds four thousand men, besides women and children, with seven loaves and a few small fishes. Matt. xv. 29—39. Mark viii. 1—9.*

In this retired neighbourhood the multitude resorted to Jesus, and stayed till the third day, so that they must have passed two nights in the open air, such was their earnestness to hear him. The necessity of supplying them with food, lest they should faint on their return, occasioned his working in their favour a miracle similar to the one already performed on or near the same spot. The persons, however, were not the same, and seem to have been chiefly heathen, who had followed him from the borders of Tyre and Sidon, for it is said that *they glorified the God of Israel*, for the variety of his miracles. In the former instance the men fed, exclusive of women and children, were five thousand, and the baskets filled with fragments, twelve; in the present, when the provisions were somewhat greater, the men were four thousand, and the baskets seven; the former answering to the number of those who fed them, in this to that of the loaves. Our translators have used *basket* in both places, but the original has two words, *κόφινος* and *σπυρίς*, which our Lord retains in his subsequent reference to them, and which are rendered in the Vulgate by *Cophinus* and *Sporta*. The latter, which occurs here, must be the largest, for in one of them St. Paul was let down along the wall at Damascus^r; and it appears from Juvenal^s, that it was the practice of the Jews to carry about with them the former. In both instances Jesus gave thanks, teaching thereby his followers to acknowledge the bounty of their heavenly Father in providing for their daily maintenance, and, according to the Jewish custom, separately for the bread and fishes, as he did for both bread and wine on the more solemn occasion of instituting the commemoration of his death. Jesus, now as

^r Acts ix. 25.

^s Sat. iii. 14.

before working the former miracle, put their faith to the test, by enquiring what was to be done; and it is strange that their recollection did not suggest an answer. That had been indeed wrought in favour of their own countrymen; and this multitude was chiefly heathen; yet this will hardly explain their dulness, for they had before them the dumb, the lame, the maimed, and the blind, whose faculties he had restored.

70. The Pharisees and Sadducees again ask a sign from Heaven. Matt. xvi. 1—4.

No two classes could be more opposite, in principle and conduct, than the Pharisees and Sadducees; yet enmity to holiness, common to both, united them to tempt Christ. They again called for a sign from Heaven: and he again declared that no sign should be given them except that of the prophet Jonah; but he first addressed them as hypocrites, for they could conjecture, from their observations upon the sky, the changes in the weather, and might, if they had been inclined, have discerned as readily the signs of the times. The sceptre was departing from Judah, for a part of the country was already a Roman province, the rest but nominally independent: Daniel's seventy weeks drew towards a close; the Baptist had appeared as the predicted herald of the Messiah; and the prophecies were fulfilling in his character and miracles; so that it needed little sagacity to perceive that, as the Baptist had announced, the reign of Heaven was at hand.

71. The disciples are warned against the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Matt. xvi. 5—12. Mark viii. 14—21.

The disciples on embarking had forgotten to supply themselves with bread, and the fragments of their late miraculous meal being exhausted, they had but a loaf remaining. While uneasy on this account, Jesus, with a reference to

what had just occurred, warned them to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, of the Sadducees, and of Herod. They took the warning literally, which led him to reprove them for distrust, as if he could not as easily supply them with necessary provisions, as the thousands whom he had twice fed by miracle; and likewise for their dulness in not comprehending that he did not allude to the leaven of bread, which, as he had already taught, was not one of the things that could defile, but to the superstition of the first, the infidelity of the second, and the worldmindedness of the third, which would sour and corrupt the mind.

72. Jesus restores the sight of a blind man by degrees.

Mark viii. 22—26.

On landing at Bethsaida, Jesus restored a blind man to sight at the request of his friends. In this miracle, as in that of the deaf man with an impediment in his speech, he employed a symbolical action. To us it seems an extraordinary one; but the Jews believed that fasting spittle had a medicinal effect on diseased eyes, and it was used by them for that purpose with prayer. The same notion prevailed among the heathen; for the blind man, who applied to the Emperor Vespasian^t, declared his persuasion that he could restore his sight by spitting into his eyes. This miracle differs from the rest recorded, in accomplishing its object by degrees. At first, the man saw objects indistinctly—men as trees walking—but Jesus touched his eyes once more, and he saw them as they really appear.

It has been well observed, that this progressive cure affords a decisive proof not only of the power, but also of the supernatural knowledge, of Christ, for it shows that he knew, seventeen centuries before it was suspected by the most sagacious and inquisitive philosophers, that the per-

^t Tacitus, Hist. iv. 81.

fection of the organs of sight without practice is not sufficient to make vision distinct. Thus, a fact, unintelligible when recorded, lies as it were useless for centuries, till an age more advanced in knowledge supplies the key to open the hidden meaning. It was universally believed, till the time of Locke, that a man born blind would immediately see as well as other men, if the organs of vision were suddenly rendered perfect: but the contrary conclusion, to which he was led by theory, was established as a fact, when Cheselden for the first time removed a cataract from the eyes of a youth who had never enjoyed sight. His patient saw, but could not discriminate objects by their figure or magnitude: they all looked extremely large, and he imagined that they touched his eyes; and he was obliged to spend a year in learning, if I may so speak, to see like other men, that is, in acquiring experience of the alterations made in the idea of sight, by judgment. The identity of imperfection observable in the vision of this young man, and of the person cured by our Lord, convinces us, that effects so similar must have been produced by the same cause; and consequently, that the subject of the miracle had been blind from his birth, though the fact is not recorded by the Evangelist. The first touch of Jesus was equivalent to the removal of the cataract, and gave the man an opportunity to describe the imperfection of his sight, in a manner sufficiently clear to prove, (not to his contemporaries, but to a more scientific age,) that this had only rendered the organs perfect. It was the second which conferred the advantages of experience, and perfected the cure. As the speech recorded by Mark could only have been made by one who had been born blind, it affords incontrovertible evidence of the reality of the miracle. Jesus led the man out of the town before curing him, and when his blindness was entirely removed, directed him not to return, nor relate the case, leaving the

inhabitants to their awful state of infidelity and impenitence^u.

73. *Peter repeats his confession, that Jesus is the Messiah.*

Matt. xvi. 13—20. Luke ix. 18—20.

On his way to the borders of Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus enquired of his Apostles what notion the people had formed concerning him, and having been told their several opinions, he asked their own, *but whom say ye that I am?* The Son of Man, the title by which he here and in several other places designates himself, is never given to him by others, and was probably assumed, both as a mark of humility, and with reference to the nature which he had taken into union with his deity, to enable him, by undergoing suffering, to atone for the sins of the human race, and to exalt us to happiness superior to that from which our progenitor fell. For he not merely restores us to the original human perfection which Adam had by transgression lost, but makes us in a subordinate sense sons of God, and joint-heirs with himself of his Father's glory. Thus, *where sin did abound*, Divine grace not only brought the remedy, but *did much more abound*. The term occurs in the Old Testament, generally as an oriental idiom for man himself; *God is not the son of man that he should repent*^x; and Ezekiel is continually so addressed by the angel, to mark the difference between their respective natures. But our Lord, it should seem, uses it to mark that he is the second Adam, the new covenant head and elder brother of the race, under whose feet, more completely than under his type the original man, God hath placed all things, and whom he has crowned with glory and honour, by exalting him to the throne of the universe, and requiring not only men but angels to worship him. In most instances the allusion is to his present humiliation or

^u Graves's Essay on the Character of the Apostles.

^x Numbers xxiii. 19.

future glory ; and Middleton considers the phrase an irrefragable proof of his pre-existence and divinity. Under this very title, he had been designated by Daniel, *Behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days; and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him*^y. To this passage he himself draws attention, not only in the parable^z, in which he appears upon his throne as the Judge of mankind, but when, upon his trial, he announced to the high priest his future advent “in glorious majesty.” His Apostles, when they speak of his priestly office, emphatically dwell upon his human nature ; as, *there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*^a. *By man came death, by Man came also the resurrection from the dead*^b. *The second Man is a quickening Spirit*^c. Anti-Trinitarians, not perceiving the reason of this reference to the nature our Lord assumed, catch at such expressions as evidence of his simple humanity. But they forget, that the beloved Apostle^d gives him this very title, on his appearing in a glory so intense, that he fell at his feet as dead, and was assured that this Son of Man was *the first and the last, and had the keys of death and of hell*. He himself also now employed it in the question, when he drew forth Peter’s prompt blessed confession in the name of all, *The Christ, the Son of the living God*; and thus the question and the answer connect together his manhood and his divinity. Our Lord pronounced Peter happy, as his conviction of the truth proceeded not from man’s teaching, nor from his own reflection, but had been revealed to him by the Father. This high commendation proves that his faith was genuine : it was, however, imperfect, for he knew not as yet that redemption was to be purchased by his

^y Dan. vii. 13.^z Matt. xxv.^a 1 Tim. ii. 5.^b 1 Cor. xv. 21.^c 1 Cor. xv. 45.^d Rev. i. 13.

Lord's blood, who was to be the Priest as well as the King of his Church. Jesus now alluded to the name which he had given him, Kephas, in Greek πέτρος, in English a stone, and figuratively declared, that upon the rock, πέτρα, from which the stone is cut, that is, upon this confession of his Divinity and his Office, (which includes atonement, and all the essential doctrines dependent on it,) he *will build his Church, and that the gates of Hades [or the grave] shall not prevail against it*, that is, that it shall endure for ever. The prophecy has been wonderfully accomplished, for neither the power nor policy of Jews or Heathens, neither the rage of persecuting Emperors, nor the more dangerous craft of Julian, could annihilate the Church at a time when no human authority sustained it; and in the dark ages of Papal supremacy, when, speaking generally, throughout Europe Christianity had been so alloyed and disfigured with superstition and error, as almost to appear another Gospel than that which the Apostles preached, its leading truths were still retained in a few obscure Alpine valleys, till they again in God's good time were announced as their Articles of Faith in the Confessions of the Protestants both of the Continent and of Britain. The religion of Mahomet, it must be confessed, has nearly banished it from the lesser Asia, the field of its earliest victories, and domineers over it in what may be called its native land; and the Candlestick of northern Africa, the land of Cyprian and Augustine, the scene of so many martyrdoms, has been long removed; but the promise is to the universal Church, not to any particular branch, and when the light has been extinguished in one country, it has been kindled in another. Thus, what has been lost in Africa and Asia, has been more than compensated by its progress first in the north of Europe, and afterwards in the new World, and by its recent triumphs at Sierra Leone, in India, and in the isles of the Pacific Ocean and New Zealand, the countries last dis-

covered by our navigators, and the first converted. And while I am revising this page, the believer is amazed and cheered by the destruction of idolatry by the army of Chinese insurgents; and we may hope, that in an unlocked for manner, by unsolicited and by unpaid native agency, Gospel truth may triumph over the atheism of the Buddhists and the idols of the Polytheists, and prevail over the farther east in China, Tartary, and at length may reach Japan.

All know, that this reply of our Lord is the chief scriptural authority to which Roman Catholics appeal in support of Papal Supremacy. The nature of this work requires rather the consideration of the scope of a discourse or speech, than a minute investigation of texts; still this is one so pregnant with meaning, and has exercised and still exercises so important an influence over individuals and nations, that it forms an exception from my rule; and therefore I shall examine, briefly considering the extent and variety of the subject, yet necessarily at some length, and historically as well as theologically, the consequences drawn from it in support of the *despotic Sovereignty* of St. Peter's reputed successors. Despotic sovereignty it may well be called, whether we look to its pretensions, or the arrogance with which it is enforced; and the title of Universal Bishop, lofty as it is, does not adequately express the extent of his jurisdiction, as he claims among his rights or royalties, as he terms them, not only to govern Bishops, who all swear to pay to him true obedience, but to create them out of the plenitude of his power, which (to use the language of Barrow^d) "hath devoured all the privileges of all orders in the Church, either granted by God, or established in the ancient Canons." It is only in an age of ignorance that a doctrine so contrary to reason could have originated; once originated, recourse was had to Scripture to sustain it, and this text was the most

^d Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, Oxford, 1836, p. 199.

favourable one that they could find. The critic will allow this application of it to be untenable; yet though he removes the foundation, the edifice still remains, undermined and shaken indeed, yet still standing, and not likely to fall, till after many repeated assaults. It is remarkable that we have no account of the introduction of Christianity into the capital of the empire; but, as there were strangers of Rome among the thousands assembled in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, when Peter and the rest founded the Christian Church, we presume that some of them carried back the Gospel to the imperial city. Whoever conveyed to the Jews settled there this blessing, we know that the Roman Church was so flourishing, that when addressed by St. Paul, its faith was spoken of throughout the whole world, though it had not as yet been visited by an Apostle. We know also from the Acts, that Peter, being liberated from prison by an Angel, and taking leave of the disciples, departed for another place, some say Antioch, others Rome; and Tradition reports, that he presided seven years over the first, and twenty-five over the latter. Ecclesiastical writers so confidently affirm both his occasional residence and his martyrdom at Rome, that I think the fact cannot be reasonably questioned, though it is impossible to adjust the chronology of his visits. He must have been absent while Paul lived there two years in a lodging, as there is no mention of him in the epistles he wrote thence to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians; nor yet when from his second confinement in a prison he informed Timothy that all had deserted him, and only Luke was with him. Allowing for a moment, for argument's sake, the supremacy of Peter himself, we can hardly suppose that, if transferable, he would bequeath it to a local Bishop, though Bishop of the Metropolis, and not rather to St. John, who long survived him. It would indeed be strange, that the beloved disciple should be placed under the jurisdiction of an obscure Linus or Anacletus, or even of a Clement,

though his name be written in the book of Life. As Barrow observes, it would have been a degradation of himself, and a disparagement of the Apostolical majesty, for him to take upon himself the Bishopric of Rome, as if the King should become a Mayor, or a Bishop a Deacon. It is reasonable to infer, that the office of Apostle died with him as with the rest, and that Bishops have from the first been limited to sees in which each was supreme, while the Apostles had exercised a general superintendence over all churches, and agreed as to the distribution of them among themselves. It was Peter's duty to itinerate, as we learn from his own epistles he did in Asia Minor, especially among believers of the circumcision, and to appoint local presbyters where congregations were collected, who it appears, from the early testimony of Irenæus, united with Bishops, as soon as they were appointed, in conferring episcopal authority. Epiphanius^e infers, that it was needful that the Apostles should constitute a resident Bishop of Rome, because they travelled often into other countries to preach, and the capital of the empire ought not to be without one. Our earliest notice of the Roman Church affords a satisfactory explanation. The two most glorious Apostles, says Irenæus^f, assigned the Episcopacy to Linus, who is named in the second Epistle to Timothy^g; to him succeeded Anacletus, and to him Clement, the author of an Epistle to the Corinthians, that they (as Rufinus affirms^h) might take the Episcopal charge, while Peter acted as an Apostle. Clement is said to have been appointed by these Apostles, the others we suppose dying before them, and he is expressly called the third, not the fourth, as he ought to have been, if St. Peter is to be reckoned as a Bishop. He made Bishops, but was none, for he was much more, he was an Apostle; and therefore the Popes must be content at the best to trace their succession to

^e Hær. 27.

^f iii. 3.

^g 2 Timothy iv. 21.

^h Præf. ad Recogn. ii. Cl.

Linus; and they can surely claim no jurisdiction beyond their own territory, the patrimony, as they call it, of St. Peter. It was reasonable that a preeminence of dignity should be allowed to the Bishop of the capital, especially by the Christians of Africa, and of the western provinces of the empire, and it was natural that ambitious Pontiffs should seek to convert respect into substantial power. It was, however, human authorities, not divine, that they called in to support their high claims, for no Scripture can be brought forward in favour of Peter's presumed successors, whatever may be thought of this speech to that Apostle as respecting himself. Nor was the attempt made till after a long period of time, for the first Bishops of Rome were too pious and humble to yield to the temptation that beset and overcame those of a later age. Clement, the companion and friend of Paul, writing to the Corinthians, in the hope of restoring, like the Apostle, harmony and peace in that distracted Church, does not presume to settle their disputes by interposing the authority of his see; nor does Ignatius, notwithstanding his anxiety to magnify the episcopal office, intimate in his epistle to the Romans that their Bishop had any higher claim to obedience than those of the other cities which he addressed. Cyprian, who had correspondence with Roman Bishops, expressly assertsⁱ the equality of the order; and none of the Fathers, from Origen to Jerome and Augustine, treat of the Roman supremacy even in their notes on this very passage, which seems to us, to invite the discussion. We learn from their extant writings, that the Popes of early times had no suspicion of their right to decide, and of what necessarily accompanies such a right, the infallibility of their judgment; for Liberius, as an example, solicited the opinion of Athanasius^k, that, whatever it was, he might follow it. To complete this negative line of argument, (and positive ones cannot be expected on a

ⁱ Ep. lv.

^k i. p. 243.

point on which there was no opponent to confute,) there is no Canon of any Council that declares the Papal Authority: and it is only named incidentally in determining the rank of the Bishop of Alexandria¹, and in assigning to that of Constantinople the seat of government, the second place of honour, because as it already enjoyed, as New Rome, equal civil privileges, it should be alike magnified in its ecclesiastical jurisdiction^m. The political arrangement of the Church accommodated itself to that of the State; and as the officers of the latter had been placed under four Praetorian Prefects, so the Bishops, Archbishops, and Metropolitans, ranked in due subordination under the four Patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria; but there was no supreme Pontiff answering to the Emperor, who, till the fall of the empire, continued though a layman, as Pontifex Maximus, to be the head of the Church. The Synod of Chalcedon, which Rome cannot refuse to acknowledge as a General Council, silenced her claims in the East; and cut off at once from her dominion a majority of sees; for of the eighteen hundred Bishops of the empire, only eight hundred were seated in the Latin provinces; and till a later age, all, whether their dioceses were spread over a province, or limited to a city, derived from the Law as well as from their divine Master, the same power and privilegesⁿ. Papists and Protestants are both apt to forget, how large a portion of Christendom, long before Protestantism had any existence, had never submitted to the Papal sway. The Maronites, and some schismatic sections of Nestorians and Armenians, and others neither numerous nor influential, are the only Latin Christians in the East; and when we recollect, that in our own days Greece has become a Monarchy, independent of the Turkish Sultan, that the Sultan himself has many Christian subjects,

¹ Conc. Nic. 6.

^m Conc. Constant. 2. Conc. Chalced. 28.

ⁿ Gibbon, vol. iii. ch. 20.

and that many of these profess the same faith, as the inhabitants of the immense Russian empire, we cannot but think that the Greek Church may become a more formidable rival, than is at first apparent, to the Roman.

In the West, however, circumstances have singularly favoured the Papacy. The Patriarchal authority was much promoted by the continued absence of the Emperors, first at Constantinople, and, after the division of the empire, at Milan or Ravenna. It was also the only European Church of any note that could claim connection with the Apostles; and above all, it was the spiritual mother of the northern nations, without or within the pale, who owe to Rome their civilization as well as their faith. Independence, which had been long secretly enjoyed, was first proclaimed by the second Gregory, A. D. 729, who, exasperated by Leo's edict against the worship of images, followed up by the destruction of them, renounced openly his allegiance, taunting him with his inability to defend Rome, and with the spirit of his seventh namesake, of an Innocent III. or a Boniface VIII. declared, that "while the Emperor alone was deaf to the voice of the Shepherd, the Barbarians submitted to the yoke of the gospel, and revered as God upon earth St. Peter, whose image he threatened to destroy." The papal power was soon consolidated by the mutual obligations of the Carlovingian dynasty and the Popes; for while the Roman empire was revived in the person of Charlemagne, he in return transformed the Pope's ancient patrimony of farms and houses, into the dominion of cities and provinces, so that the world beheld for the first time a Bishop, invested with the prerogatives of a temporal prince. The power thus acquired was soon completed, and sanctified by extraordinary fraud. The "False Decretals" and the "Donation of Constantine," the "two magic pillars," as Gibbon^o calls them, "of spiritual and temporal monarchy,"

^o Decline and Fall, vol. ix. ch. 49.

and the most celebrated monuments of human imposture and credulity, were put forth about the conclusion of the eighth century, and immediately and universally received as genuine^p. Their direct object was the unlimited advancement of the Roman See, which the former accomplished chiefly by asserting the Pope's exclusive right of summoning Councils, by subjecting other Bishops to him alone, and by promoting the practice of appeals to Rome. The Decretals are a series of Epistles professing to be written by the earliest Bishops of Rome, and were brought out from the comparative obscurity in which they had reposed for above two centuries and a half, by Gregory the Seventh, who probably never doubted their authenticity, and rejoiced in the possession of an instrument, which he could employ so powerfully in promoting his ambitious scheme of domineering over both Church and State. These fabrications of an unknown author, as they are now allowed to be, imposed for ages upon Emperors, and even Popes; and though long since given up by their most bigotted advocates, still retain their place in the Canon Law. By a singular felicity, while the foundation is removed, the edifice remains. No historical fact is better attested than that the first Christian Emperor continued a catechumen till the approach of death; yet the legend received for centuries, though now rejected, relates how Constantine was baptized at Rome by Pope Sylvester, in the Baptistry of St. John Lateran, and, departing to found his new capital in the East, resigned to him the free and perpetual sovereignty of the West. According to this fable, the Pope reigned, not by the favour of modern princes, but by a grant of the first Christian Emperor, and was discharged from his debt of gratitude to Charlemagne and his successors, since upon this theory their donation was only the restitution of a scanty portion of his rightful inheritance. It must be confessed, that in ages of

^p Waddington's History of the Church, p. 223, 286.

feudal licentiousness and cruelty, the influence of the Church and its acknowledged head was beneficially exerted in promoting civilization and humanity, and in enforcing justice, when these objects did not interfere with the peculiar claims of Rome. This and other concurring causes less honourable, such as the selfishness of some eminent churchmen and the timidity of others, and the mutual jealousy of Sovereigns, rivetted the chains of Europe. Christendom was overawed by a spiritual Sovereignty, which, more ambitious than that of ancient Rome, aspired to reign over the souls as well as the bodies of men, and comprehended within its limits purgatory as well as earth. Its doctrines harmonized with the prevailing superstition, while its ceremonies captivated the imagination, and worked upon the feelings. Its claims were urged, not always in a parental, sometimes in a tyrannical tone, and it had therefore occasionally to encounter opposition. Still, though it placed kingdoms under interdict and deposed kings, Rome contrived to come victorious out of the combat, partly by setting sovereign against sovereign, and partly through the agency both of the regular and secular clergy, whose feelings were all, through a compulsory celibacy, absorbed in the advancement of the Church. In vain had the Council of Constance, A. D. 1414, decreed its own supremacy, deposed rival popes, and elected a new one: the claim to obedience was still no less haughtily made, till, as it appears to me, the acmé of power was reached, when Alexander VI. A. D. 1493, conferred upon the Crown of Castile the right to possess all that Columbus had discovered, or what might yet be discovered; and, drawing a line along the map, gave away by a stroke of his pen half the habitable world. The Portuguese indeed contested the validity of the act, but they did not rest their opposition upon any rational ground; they only maintained, that in a similar manner a preceding Pope had previously bestowed the same rights upon them. The Papacy, considered in its origin,

duration, and success, is the most wonderful phenomenon in history. It is perhaps not extraordinary, that in a superstitious age a man like Gregory VII. should triumph over an emperor; but it is astonishing, that their power should have been so established, that it survived both their crimes and their mistakes in policy. Popes were set up against popes, and both pope and anti-pope were often overbearing, sometimes profligate; and for seventy years they voluntarily divested themselves of the charm to which they owed their advancement from prelacy to sovereignty, when as vassals of France they exchanged the banks of the Tiber for those of the Rhone. A Julius acted the part of Cæsar, and a profligate Leo⁴ became the patron of letters and the fine arts; when in the plenitude of his prosperity, this voluptuary was awakened from his dreams of pleasure and ambition by the voice of a monk, the son of a Saxon miner, who shook to its foundations his cloud-capped gorgeous palace, declared war against Rome, committed its bulls to the flames, A.D. 1517, and denounced to Christendom its profligate sale of pardons. These gross abuses had long been lamented by the pious; but it was reserved for Luther to overthrow its foundation, by restoring from the epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, the long-forgotten truth of Justification by Faith only, "that most wholesome doctrine, very full of comfort," the standard, as he called it, of a rising or falling church. Yet, such is the vitality of the system, that though the north of Europe has been ever since lost to Rome, it has been able through the Inquisition to crush the Reformation in Spain and Italy, and through the bigotry of the sovereign to weaken it in France. Through the order of the Jesuits, coeval with Luther, especially sworn to promote the interests of the pope, Rome has recovered much that it had lost. It has improved in discipline from the pontiff to the friar, and has got a stronger hold of schools and the

⁴ Waddington's History of the Church, p. 652.

confessional. Reestablished after the storm of the French republic and empire, it still governs not now by force but by persuasion, no longer a roaring lion, but having the voice of a lamb.

The only Scriptural grounds which Romanists bring forward in support of papal supremacy is this reply to Peter, and the Saviour's thrice repeated charge to him after the Resurrection, (which I shall consider in its proper connection,) and yet it is impossible to show that either is more than personal, and can be transmitted to another. The Apostolic office is even by them allowed to be such in all other instances, and why should an extension of the grant be made more to Peter than to John? In them, and we may conclude in him, it was temporary, not successive; conferred in a special manner, designed for special purposes; discharged by special aids, and endured with special privileges, for the founding of churches; and for that office it was requisite that this functionary should have an immediate commission from God, and should be able to attest our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension. He should also possess miraculous gifts, and no one diocese, not even Rome, but the world, was to be his Province. This Apostleship then was not transferable; but to confine our attention to Peter, to whom the speech was exclusively addressed, its meaning, as far as we are concerned, is a subject more of curiosity than importance, since his preeminence, in whatever it might consist, has long since passed away. Two interpretations have been current from the beginning, before the judgment of the supporters of either could have been warped against or in favour of the Pope. The earliest, (for it is recorded by Justin Martyr, not half a century after St. John,) considers the rock on which Christ professes to build his Church to be Peter's confession: the later, which first I believe appears in Cyprian^r, takes it for his person: Chrysostom

said, upon this *rock*, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, not upon this *stone*, ἐπὶ τῷ πέτρῳ, for he did not build the Church upon the man, but upon his faith. According to Bp. Marsh^s, these distinctions between *πέτρος* and *πέτρᾳ* in Greek, and *petrus* and *petra* in the Vulgate, are unworthy of a critic, as our Saviour spoke in Syriac; and in the version in that language, the same word *Cepha*, in Greek Κηφᾶς, is used in both places, both as an appellative and a proper name. But he shows his own ignorance; for, as Lightfoot remarks, his *confession* appears to me to be more in harmony with the analogy of faith than his *person*, as the Church, strictly speaking, is built upon our blessed Master himself, (though certainly I conceive not so implied in this place, as many ancient German Protestant commentators maintain,) who is *that stone, that tried stone, that precious corner stone*, which *the Lord God hath laid in Zion for a sure foundation*^t; and Paul, in his comparison of it to a material fabric, marks the equality of its ministers in this respect. *Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone*^u. That he knew of no supreme pastor upon earth, no vicar of Christ, no head of the Catholic Church, is evident from what he writes to the Ephesians^x, and to the Corinthians^y, that *God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets*, in which words we hear him, according to Chrysostom, placing, when reckoning up powers, the Apostolical office in the highest rank. The authorities, both ancient and modern, preponderate in favour of the person. This, however, is immaterial, as they substantially coincide; for the text conveys, as paraphrased by Dr. Wells, this sense; “Thou art Peter, that is, a *Rock*, so named by me, as foreseeing, that by thy constancy in this confession, after my resurrection and ascension, thou shalt eminently be what thy name imports, a firm and immoveable

^s Chap. x.^t Isaiah xxviii. 16.^u Eph. ii. 20.^x Eph. iv. 11.^y 1 Cor. xii. 28.

professor of the truth. And as upon the foundations of my Apostles in general, so *upon thee*, this *Rock*, in a special manner, namely, as the first and most eminent part of the foundation, *I will build my Church*.

Whichever interpretation we may adopt, this declaration can mean no more than what is conveyed in the following words, *to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of Heaven*; which denotes, as we learn from his conduct on the day of Pentecost, and from the baptism of Cornelius, that he was the person chosen for the high honour of opening the Church both to Jews and Proselytes. The possession of the keys in this sense is Peter's only peculiar privilege, that is, priority in service, not superiority in power; and this commission fulfilled by him once for all, could not, from its nature, be repeated. That privilege, it is evident, gave him no higher authority than the other Apostles, for if he had a power given him of binding and loosing, so had they, and therefore in as ample measure, and couched in the very same terms. Had he a privilege to remit and retain sins? It was by virtue of a common promise. Had he power and obligation to feed the sheep of Christ? So had they, so had others by authority derived from them. Was his commandment universal and unlimited? So was theirs by the same immediate authority, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature*. They, as Chrysostom expresses it, were all in common entrusted with the whole world, and had the care of all nations. Whatever Jerome and other fathers may say, this declaration did not give Peter even an honorary precedence; for though he was present in the Council of Jerusalem, James presided; and we know that on another occasion, even at Antioch, reputed his peculiar See, St. Paul withheld him publicly, because he was to blame, and that on an essential point; a fact which disproves his own infallibility, and of course, that of his reputed successors. It is indeed observable, that upon all

occasions our Lord showed a particular regard to him above his colleagues, and he spoke for the rest when they could not all speak; but even after this promise, we find them more than once disputing amongst themselves who should be their chief. This strife our Lord checked, not by telling them that he had already decided the case by appointing him their president, but that he intended to have no monarch in his Church, but that they should all be on an equality. *Be not ye called Rabbi, [Teacher,] for one is your Master, [Teacher,] even Christ, and all ye are brethren^z.* *The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, but it shall not be so with you.* Thus did our Lord forbid that any of them should, like the sovereigns of the world, exercise dominion over the rest. Surely the Apostles could not have understood him in the same sense as modern Romanists, for would they have contended for the chief place, if they had understood that it was Peter's by our Lord's own previous nomination? Would they have enquired of him who should be the greatest in his kingdom, if they knew that our Lord had announced his will? Their equality has been declared too frequently and too clearly to be mistaken; and we know that it was rightly understood by Peter himself; for in his epistles he does not command as Christ's Vicar, but *exhorts the elders as also an elder^a.* Instead of referring them for guidance to an infallible successor^b, *when he has put off his tabernacle;* he writes *to put them in remembrance*, and having charged them *to feed the flock^c, not as being lords over God's heritage, but ensamples,* he calls upon them to render an account of their stewardship, not to his successor at Rome, but *to the Bishop of their souls, the only chief Shepherd,* whom he acknowledges, from whom they, who are appointed by the Holy Ghost *overseers, [bishops,] shall,*

^z Matt. xxiii. 8.

^a 1 Pet. v. 1.

^b 2 Pet. i. 14.

^c 2 Pet. v. 2, 3.

when He shall appear, receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away^d.

We see then that the Papal claim to govern the Church derives no support from Scripture; and the silence of Scripture is borne out by History, and by the undeniable fact of the limited faculties of man. We can imagine a Prelate presiding, though inadequately, over the clergy and the ecclesiastical concerns of a mighty empire, as one king can direct its temporal affairs; but the difficulty awfully augments in the ratio of its increasing extent and population; and the sovereignty of the world would be too burdensome for human nature. View Rome as the final court of appeal from inferior tribunals, and as sending their pall to all the Archbishops of Christendom, which has been long partitioned into monarchies and republics, speaking different languages, and varying in opinions and habits, customs and institutions! Without counting upon the millions, who we hope will in time be comprehended within its pale, take Christendom as it now is, from the North Cape, and reappearing after an intervening blank of idolatry in the southern extremity of the globe, in the East, and extending from India to nearly the whole of the new world, and say where we shall discover an individual, in any degree equal to such an office? Even suppose his will as pure as can be wished, and his zeal indefatigable, no knowledge or wisdom short of infinite are competent to such an undertaking. What judgment then can we pronounce on him, who, being no more than a man, presumes to seat himself as Christ's Vicegerent on his throne? May he not be truly said to *exalt himself above all that is called God, and is worshipped?* He alone, whose eyes are in every place beholding the evil and the good, can worthily occupy that throne; and it should have been reserved for him, who at his next advent will *take to himself his great power, and reign*, judging from it man-

^d Acts xx. 28.

kind, at the close of the present dispensation^e. The grand argument, urged for a visible head of the universal Church, is the necessity of having a judge to decide controversies; but an infallible judge on earth, if such could be found, is not suited to the present established scheme of probation; and they who boast of this privilege only mock us with a show of uniformity. It was the artful policy of Bossuet, to exaggerate the differences of opinion among all who had withdrawn from the self-styled seat of unity; but he has been recently stigmatized by a divine^f, who has examined his History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches, as an unprincipled and unscrupulous advocate, adopting without investigation every unfavourable report. In their own, notwithstanding their boast of uniformity of opinion, it has never really prevailed, for their oracle has not ventured to speak, when speaking would offend any powerful party; as, for instance, it has not decided the Predestinarian controversy, which has agitated Dominicans and Jesuits as much as Calvinists and Arminians; while it has been proved by a comparison of the accredited formularies of the Protestant Churches, as the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions, and our own Articles, which are in part taken from them, that, though from circumstances they differ in government and discipline, they are in doctrine substantially one^g.

^e Dr. Hinds' (now Bishop of Norwich) *Three Temples of the one true God contrasted*, Oxford, 1830, p. 33.

^f Archdeacon Hare's *Sermons on the Comforter*.

^g See *Harmonia Confessionum Fidei Orthodox. et Reformat. Ecclesiarum*, Genevæ 1851; or the translation into English, Cambridge 1586.

74. *Jesus plainly foretells his Death and Resurrection, rebukes Peter, and exhorts them all to self-denial.* Matt. xvi. 11—28. Mark viii. 31—38. Luke ix. 22—27.

Having elicited the confession of his being the Messiah, and having confirmed its truth by the authority he in consequence committed to Peter, Jesus proceeded to reveal more explicitly than he had done hitherto, the real nature of his reign, and checked their rising hopes of wealth and dignity, by declaring that he must go to Jerusalem, not to assume his sovereignty, but to be put to death. This was so contrary to the worldly triumph which they anticipated, that Peter, who, with the rest of his countrymen, had overlooked the predictions of an afflicted and rejected Messiah, and was perhaps elated by the commendation he had just received, expressed with the affection of ignorance his hope that his Master was mistaken. But Jesus silenced him in the very words with which he had before rebuked the devil: *Get thee behind me, Satan*, that is, *Enemy*, adding, that he was *a stumbling-block^h*, in tempting him to give up, on account of the suffering and shame which awaited him, the work which he had come into the world to accomplish, declaring that he did not *relish* (*φγοεῖν*) the spiritual *things of God*, *but the things of man*, such as ease, honour, and riches. He then called to him the people, as self-denial was equally the duty of all, and said, that whoever was disposed to follow him, must deny his natural inclinations, and must be ready, if called upon, even to die in his cause. He added for their encouragement, that he who was faithful unto death, would hereafter receive an adequate recompense, as much more valuable than earthly life, as that life is to its accompanying enjoyments, which can profit nothing a person about to quit it. To strengthen them to endure the temporary

^h An offence. A. T.

privations to which he called them, he brought before their minds the future judgment, declaring that when he came in glory, he would then be ashamed of those who now were ashamed of him. Probably there was some expression of incredulity upon their countenances, as he cautioned them against unbelief, and declared that some who were present should not die till they saw him coming in his reign. That generation has long since passed away, and Christ, as we know, has not yet come in his own glory, and in that of his Father, to reward every man according to his work. The obvious interpretation then cannot be the true one, and another must be sought. Some commentators interpret it of his showing himself six days after to his three most confidential Apostles, in the original glory, which he had quitted in order to become flesh. This, the opinion of Chrysostom, is ably supported by Bishop Porteus. But so short an interval seems fatal to it, since surely not some, but all present, must have outlived his Transfiguration, which was also not so much the commencement as the anticipation of his sovereignty. And therefore it appears better to refer it to that period, when our Lord, perfected by sufferings, divested himself of *the form of a servant*, and ascended to his Father, when he properly commenced his reign, and came in glory, by sending down on his followers the gift of the Holy Ghost; and not long after, came in the clouds, that is, through the arrangement of his providence, to remove that great obstacle to its progress, the religious polity of the Jews. As St. John, who is supposed to be specially intended, outlived the destruction of the Temple and its service, this interpretation appears to be the best, and harmonizes with the declaration of his Master concerning him, *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?* and with his prophecy, that the present generation would not pass away till it saw the sign of the Son of Man in heaven. His discourse had not overcome their prejudices, and there-

fore he endeavoured to impress the truth upon their minds, as on other occasions, by a significant action. The scene of this change, or transfiguration, as we translate metamorphosis, was a mountain, which Jesus ascended with Peter, James, and John, in order to pray, and in the act of prayer he was transfigured.

*75. The Transfiguration. Matt. xvii. 1—13. Mark ix. 1—13.
Luke ix. 28—36.*

These three disciples saw their Master daily in the *form of a servant*, as the Son of man. On this one occasion they were permitted to behold him *as the only-begotten of the Father*, and enjoyed as complete a view of him *in the form of God* as they were able to bear. His appearance, bright and dazzling as the sun, or the snow that capped the mountains, would give them some faint conception of the glory which he had enjoyed before his incarnation, and would resume after his ascension; and some anticipation too of the glory which awaited them, when hereafter his almighty energy should transform their vile mortal bodies into a resemblance of his, when they should become like him, from seeing him as he is. It would also serve to explain to them the meaning of Peter's recent confession, *Thou art the Son of the living God*; and to support their faith during his approaching humiliation unto death. There appeared also in glory, Moses and Elijah, the Giver and the Restorer of the Law, in a period of all but universal defection; and these conversed with Jesus concerning his decease; the very subject on which Peter had so lately presumed to reprehend him. This ought to have convinced them that such a termination of his mission would be no disgrace, but was required by his office of Messiah. But they seem to have already fallen asleep. Peter, awaking, broke out into an exclamation, that it was good to remain there, and not go down to meet the sufferings, of which he was so reluctant to

hear. In this, however, he was mistaken, he understood not what he said. The sacrifice, necessary to his acceptance, must first be offered, and services remained for him and his brethren to perform, which would promote the Divine glory by the extension and edification of the Church after their own decease, even to the end of time. He seems to have considered Jesus, Moses, and Elijah, as of equal dignity and authority, for he adds, *Let us make three tabernacles.* While the Apostle was thus speaking, a bright cloud, like that, we may presume, which hung over the Mercy-seat in the first temple, the symbol of the Divine Presence, overshadowed them, and out of it a voice was heard, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;* the same testimony that was borne to him at his baptism; but to it was now added the command, *Hear ye him,* that is, in preference to Moses and Elijah. They are God's servants, he alone his Son; they came not to share his glory, but to acknowledge the preeminence of him, by whose obedience the morality of the law was magnified, and in whose passion and death its ceremonies and types were about to be fulfilled. Moses and Elijah vanished; Christ alone remained, the sole and unrivalled object of their reverence. The glory of the vision was more than the faculties of men still in the body could long endure; so awed and overpowered, they lay with their faces on the ground, till Jesus touched them, and encouraged them to rise. On arising, and looking round, they found that the visitants from the world of spirits had departed, and that their Master was alone with them, in his usual appearance. Some suppose that as the face of Moses shone, when he came down from his conference with God in Mount Sinai, so some degree of brightness lighted up that of Jesus, because the multitude expressed amazement on his return, and treated him with more than ordinary deference. If such were the fact, the impression produced was very different, and characteristic of the Law to the Gospel.

When Moses came down, the Israelites were afraid of approaching him; but the people came running to salute the Mediator of the new covenantⁱ, it may be, attracted by the glory of God shining in his face, or simply from the expectation of ejecting a demon, who had baffled the power of his Apostles.

On descending, he charged them not to mention the vision till after his resurrection, not even, it should seem, to the nine. Before that event it would not have obtained credit; and it was designed, at present, more for their own support than the conviction of others. John seems to refer to this Transfiguration^k, when in the introduction to his gospel he speaks of having seen the glory of the Logos; and in his exile in Patmos he was cheered by a similar and longer view of his Redeemer in the robes of High Priest, with a countenance shining like the sun in his strength, and *eyes like a flame of fire*. The scene, transitory as it was, made such an abiding impression upon Peter, that in his second epistle, written long after, a little before his death, he argues from it, that he had not followed *cunningly devised fables*; and had neither deceived, nor been mistaken, for he had been an eyewitness of the majesty of the Lord Jesus Christ, *when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, which he heard when he was with him in the holy mount*^l. *The Law and the Prophets were until John*, who came to usher in the Christian dispensation; and this appearance of Moses and Elijah seems to announce that their authority was about to vanish away. This will assist in explaining the injunction of secrecy, since the abolition of the ceremonial law was one of the truths which even the Apostles were unable to bear, till taught it by the Holy Ghost. His mention of the resurrection of the Son of Man perplexed them, as with the rest of their countrymen they believed that the Messiah was to abide for ever; and they

ⁱ Mark ix. 15.

^k John i. 14.

^l 2 Peter i. 16—19.

could not understand why Elijah had disappeared, for it was the popular notion that he should come to prepare the nation for his advent, according to the prophecy of Malachi. The fact the Messiah allowed, but explained it in a manner that showed, that the person designated by that figure to announce his first coming was the Baptist; and our Lord's explanation authorizes, where the context requires it, the figurative interpretation of Prophecy, though commentators till of late have too much abandoned the literal meaning, which, when no overpowering objection can be shown, ought to be preferred.

76, 77. Jesus on his descent cures a demoniac, whom his disciples were unable to dispossess. Matt. xvii. 14—21. Mark ix. 14—29. Luke ix. 37—42.

During their absence, a father had brought for cure to the remaining nine, his son, whom a demon tormented with epilepsy, then called lunacy, because supposed to be under the influence of the moon. On their late mission they had found the evil spirits subject to them; but in this attempt they failed, not, I apprehend, because this demon was more difficult to cast out than others, but because their faith had diminished. Our Lord on his return found the Scribes disputing with them; arguing, we may suppose from the failure of the servants, to the inability of the Master. And his address, *faithless and perverse generation*, which includes both, supports this explanation. He revived the father's hope, by ordering the demoniac to be brought to himself; and after suffering the demon to display his tremendous power, by throwing down and convulsing the boy, dismissed him by a word of authority. The faith of the father was feebler than that of many, but it was genuine, for it brought him as a suppliant, notwithstanding the failure of the Apostles; and his petition, *Increase my faith*, seems to show a conception, however indistinct, of the superiority of Jesus to a prophet,

and of his power not only of casting out evil spirits, but also of enlightening the understanding, and influencing the heart. Still it was feeble, for his speech is, *If thou canst do any thing;* to which our Lord returns this answer, *If thou canst believe;* showing the necessity of faith. Jesus commanded the evil spirit with more than usual authority, *I charge thee,* and, *Enter into him no more;* and most reluctantly did it withdraw, leaving him apparently dead, till Jesus took him by the hand.

As soon as they were in private, the Apostles asked the cause of their failure; and he replied in figurative language, that neither this, or any other work, is impossible to faith. The minutest measure of it will remove a mountain; but as in these latter ages even the largest produces not the wonderful effects which we might expect from his reply, we are led to the conclusion, that the faith spoken of is not that grace which still remains in the Church, *the realising of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen,* but a persuasion which enabled the possessor to work miracles, which, like the other extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, has been withdrawn. It is enumerated among them in the first epistle to the Corinthians^m, in which, as in this passage, it is said to be capable of removing mountains, and also to be separable from charity, neither of which can be predicated of justifying faith. Yet still to this latter *faith which worketh by love* we may apply in a lower sense the promise; for we might enumerate, since miracles have ceased, under the present administration of Divine Providence, the successful establishment of many philanthropical institutions, which have originated in this principle; such as the Halle Orphan House, which extorted from the unbeliever Frederic of Prussia the confession, that Francke its founder was a great man; and the Society for Propagating the Gospel, which now enjoying the highest patronage, has supported for near a century and a half, at first alone,

^m Chap. xiii.

the Missionary cause, and has preserved the episcopacy of North America. Influential and comparatively wealthy, it may be traced up to "an Ordinance of the Commonwealth, 1649, for the promoting and propagating of Christianity;" chiefly with a reference to New England, then the sole English colony. This Society became dead in law on the Restoration, but was revived in 1662, by a Charter from Charles II. who most appropriately nominated the pious philosopher Boyleⁿ its first Governor. I may appeal also to the now flourishing Missionary associations of our own times, both in the Church and among Dissenters, which have sprung up out of zeal for God's glory, accompanied with an implicit reliance on his support. If we then individually achieve less than other believers, whose ability or opportunities do not exceed ours, it is because we are *straitened*, not in God, but *in ourselves*; it is because if we have faith, it is not like theirs vigorous, but weak and wavering. "Pains and prayer through Christ can do any thing," was the declaration of the early Missionary Eliot, on completing his version of the whole Bible into the language of Virginia; which is now more dead than the learned tongues, since there is no one left who understands it. "Attempt great things, expect great things," was the motto of one of our own time, (the late Dr. Carey of Serampore,) who has been the instrument of translating it into Sanscrit and almost all its numerous derivative dialects, and so has rendered the tidings of salvation accessible to millions of Hindu idolaters. Even the heathen Quintilian teaches the same lesson; for he says, speaking of eloquence and the fine arts, (and the observation is still more applicable to the pursuits of the Christian,) that it has sometimes happened that great things have been accomplished by him, who was striving at what was above his power. Our Lord proceeded to say, that prayer and fasting are required for the casting out of all demons; for though this was a case of peculiar

ⁿ Birch's Life of Robert Boyle, 1744, p. 141.

malignity, inferior only, if at all, to that of the Gadara demoniac, throwing the boy from childhood into fits, and causing him to pine away, I do not conceive that the language he employed conveys, as the translation does, the idea of different degrees of power in demons, but that this kind means the whole race. And we may hence infer the expediency and the efficacy of such exercises for the subjection of sinful propensities, and the conquest of evil habits; since Scripture is not of *private* interpretation^o, but, independent of its primary meaning, has a secondary application to the circumstances of the believers of all ages.

78. *Jesus procures by a miracle the tribute-money for himself and Peter.* Matt. xvii. 24—27.

As Peter's house at Capernaum was regarded as the residence of Jesus, it was to that disciple that the collectors of the tribute applied to know if his Master would pay it. Their question shows that it was a voluntary payment; it therefore could not be a Roman tax, as often represented; and this also appears from our Saviour's argument, which rests his right of exemption upon his being the Son of the Sovereign for whom it was levied, an argument which owes its whole weight to his Divinity. It was, in fact, an annual contribution from all males above twenty years of age towards the expenses of religion, originating with Moses; and not only raised in Palestine, but remitted also by the Jews who were settled at Rome or in the provinces of the empire^p. It did not, however, cease with the service to support which it was originally levied; for on the destruction of Jerusalem, the Emperor Vespasian made it compulsory,

^o 2 Peter i. 20.

^p This we learn from Cicero, who in his Oration for Flaccus praises that Governor for prohibiting the remittance of it from his Province, and shows throughout his contempt for a state which he stigmatises as “*suspiciosa et maledica.*”

and transferred it from the temple of the true God to that of Jupiter in the Capitol. Thus the worshipper of Jehovah had to endure the mortification of being taxed for the maintenance of the idolatry of his conquerors. The amount was half a shekel, fifteen-pence of English money, equivalent to the double drachma of the Greek mint; the stater, therefore, a coin equal to four drachma, would pay for both Jesus and Peter, but being from its idolatrous symbols profane, it must be changed into Hebrew money, and this custom gave employment to many money changers.

Jesus first convinced Peter that there was no need that he who was greater than the temple should pay this contribution; but he waived his privilege, to prevent the scandal which would have been caused by a refusal, which would be construed into contempt; since he could not assign to others the reason he had given Peter, without declaring himself the Son of God, nor could he well withdraw from the engagement made for him by his disciple. Neither of them owned the small sum required; he therefore ordered Peter to angle in the lake, telling him that he would find the coin, which would exactly settle the claim upon them both, in the mouth of the first fish which he caught; and by this mode of procuring it, he preserved the dignity which Peter had compromised. By whatever means the stater was there lodged, Omniscience could alone discover it, and Omnipotence secure its being brought to Peter's hook. The voluntary poverty for the benefit of mankind of him, who might, if it had pleased him, have commanded as readily all hidden treasure, ought to excite our admiration and gratitude. Christ teaches us by this example, that when we have not the means of convincing men of a mistake, we ought rather to undergo some cost or inconvenience, than leave an unfavourable impression on their mind. But the misconceptions of those who, like the Pharisees, are blinded by malice, he did not care to correct.

79. *The Apostles contend for preeminence, and are told that it can only be acquired through humility. Jesus condemns the bigotry of his disciples, warns them against causing weak believers to stumble, and by a parable teaches forgiveness.* Matt. xviii. Mark ix. 30—50. Luke ix. 46—50.

Jesus, on their arrival at Capernaum, enquired of his disciples the subject of their discussion on the road. Shame kept them silent, for they had been engaged in no edifying conversation, but had disputed concerning their respective claims to preeminence in the kingdom, which they presumed he was about to establish. Had he designed to confer greater authority or higher rank upon Peter than on his brethren, this would surely have been the time to announce it; but he decidedly condemned this carnal ambition in them all, speaking to their thoughts and desires, which they had not ventured to utter, in the manner of the ancient prophets, not in words alone, but also by a most significant action. Calling them around him, he placed a little child in the midst, solemnly assuring them, that unless they became in disposition as humble and unambitious, they could not enter into his kingdom; and that their advancement in it would be in proportion to their humility, and to their brotherly love: for whoever among his followers aspired to be chief, must behave himself as the least, and as the servant of all. Some have argued from this speech the perfect innocence of children, in opposition to the doctrine of Original Sin, upon which our religion rests, and which is so plainly affirmed both in the Old and the New Testament; but comparisons must not be pressed beyond the speaker's obvious intention; and the unbiased reader will allow that our Lord only meant to notice the quality in which his disciples were deficient, and in which the object of comparison excelled—indifference to distinction. The first dispute concerning preeminence soon followed the

Transfiguration, and might have been the result of it. The three who had been permitted to witness it, might in consequence look forward to some distinction above their brethren, and in consequence take too much upon them; while James, Thaddæus, and Simon the Zelot, might build upon their relationship to their Master.

John then mentioned, that he had forbidden a man who cast out demons in the name of Jesus, because he did not, like them, accompany him. But his Master, far from commanding, reprobated his zeal as mistaken; *Forbid him not; whoever is not against us, is for us.* This admonition warns us to respect those, who, by their preaching, bring sinners to repentance and faith in Christ, though not sent forth, by those whom we regard as authorized to ordain, and to leave them to pursue their course unmolested, instead of attempting to silence them. God, the Author of the ordinary vocation, has not restricted himself by rules, but dispenses with them when it pleases him; and who shall presume to interfere with his sovereign will? Yet this extraordinary call must be ascertained to be authentic by its effects; for this man did not merely call upon demons to leave the possessed, but actually expelled them.

Jesus then pronounced a woe upon those who cause weak believers to stumble, declaring that it is better to part with every thing most precious to us, represented under the image of an eye, a hand, and a foot, than, by causing one of these little ones to draw back, to incur eternal punishment. This doctrine is so odious to the carnal mind, that even divines, well acquainted with the Scriptures, have maintained the final happiness of all mankind after a sufficient period of suffering. It is easy for ingenious men to render plausible what their readers wish to be true; but in order to convince, they ought to be able to show, that (as poets have feigned, and philosophers have imagined) punishment has a reforming and purifying tendency. Experience, I

believe, proves the reverse in this world; and there seems to me to be reason to believe, that in the next, as the spirits cast down to hell and reserved to judgment, instead of being drawn by their long sufferings to admire the perfections of the Deity, and to grieve that they have disobeyed him, only hate him the more for his very excellence; so the wicked of our race who shall depart into *the fire prepared for the Devil and his angels*, deprived of restraining grace, and left to themselves and their evil companions, will sink from depth to depth of depravity. But, without engaging in the philosophical question, I observe, that no philological criticism can lower our Saviour's language. It has been attempted to explain *aiώνιος*, the Greek word we translate *eternal*, as if it did not mean a strict eternity, but a period of long and indefinite duration; but even granting for argument's sake what is not true, that this meaning could be established, it is plain that the words of Christ, *unquenchable fire*, declare its eternal continuance; and the refuge of annihilation will not remain, for the doctrine—that though the fire be itself eternal, it will destroy those cast into it—is overturned by the expression, *the worm that dieth not*; from which we also learn, that, exclusive of eternal sufferings, the damned will have to endure the anguish and gnawing, as it were, of a self-reproaching conscience. The words themselves are borrowed from the conclusion of Isaiah's prophecies, and refer apparently to the two methods by which the dead are disposed of, burning and interment. If eternal punishment be threatened to the impenitent offender, the veracity of God, who cannot lie, and will not change his purpose, assures us, that the threat will be fulfilled; and it follows, that though it be more congenial to the spirit of Christianity to draw men by *the cords of love*, there are some who are to be convinced only by *the terrors of the Lord*. How awful then is the responsibility of those who not only neglect but oppose

God's own method of awakening hardened sinners! Lest pride should tempt them to despise the least of those that believe in him, however weak their faith, or however great may have been their failings, Jesus declared not only that the most exalted angels disdain not to minister to these little ones, but that the *Son of Man himself has come to seek and to save that which is lost*; and he illustrated his Father's desire for the conversion of sinners by the conduct of a shepherd, who will leave his whole flock in order to search for a single stray sheep.

Having spoken of those who injured their brethren, he next treated the case of the injured, and laid down rules for their behaviour, which, if honestly followed, would seldom fail of producing reconciliation. The advantage of agreement he enforced by assuring them, that whenever even two of them should agree in making the same request to his Father, it should be granted; for, he continued, *wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*. There cannot be a stronger encouragement to social and family prayer, nor a more effectual admonition to its reverent performance, while it necessarily implies his omnipresence, which cannot be predicated of a creature; and as he spoke to Jews, they must have thus understood him; for it is one of their sayings still, that where ten are assembled to study the Law, there the Deity is present; and this number is required to justify the establishment of a Synagogue.

The mention of disagreement, led Peter to enquire how often he was bound to forgive an offending brother, and thinking some limitation necessary to guard the precept against abuse, suggested *seven times*, in conformity, it is said, with the opinion of the most liberal of the Jewish casuists, and, as he might think, of Jesus himself, who on another occasion required a penitent to be forgiven that number of times. But now he said, *seventy times seven*; and he

assigned a reason for such indulgence in a parable, which shows that even this larger number is to be taken indefinitely, and that there is no other limit than the disposition of the offender who must sue for forgiveness. The mercy of God and the cruelty of man are then finely contrasted, under the figure of a sovereign forgiving, on his petition, a debtor who owed him, on the lowest computation^q, near two millions sterling; the latter, under that of the same debtor, demanding, and in a fierce and brutal manner, of a fellow-slave, about three pounds he owed him, the instant after he had been himself forgiven six hundred thousand times as much^r. The first, which we may consider as the revenue of a province, it was impossible to discharge; for none can make satisfaction to God for sin. The latter might have been paid, for our obligations to our fellow men are comparatively small. The sovereign puts on the appearance of severity, but it is no more than the appearance; for though he orders him to be imprisoned, and his wife and children to be sold, no sooner does the slave worship him, exclaiming, *have patience with me, and I will pay thee all*, than he forgives him, though he could never have fulfilled his promise. The forgiven debtor is unmoved by the petition of his fellow servant, though urged in his own words, and easy to be accomplished. The other servants are grieved, the master is justly angry, and reproaches him not for his debt, but his want of mercy. His implacability causes his master to revoke his pardon; and we learn out of the mouth of him who taught us to ask for forgiveness, on the plea of our granting it, that God will never bestow it on the unforgiving. Every reader must perceive the striking contrast between the characters of the merciful lord and the cruel servant, and the amount of their respective debts. It

^q That is, if we reckon by the Greek talent: the Jewish would make it more than double.

^r Talent, £193 15s. Denarius, 8½d.

silences whatever justification, or palliation of revenge, can be drawn from the nature or number of the offences committed, or the dignity and merit of the injured party.

80. *Jesus sends forth the Seventy.* Luke x. 1—16.

As Jesus in an earlier period of his ministry had sent forth the twelve Apostles, he now commissioned seventy disciples, in imitation, probably, of the elders appointed by Moses to assist him. The appointment is recorded only by Luke; but the tradition that he was one of them is probably erroneous; since the preface to his gospel seems to declare, that he did not write from personal knowledge. The twelve had been allowed to go where they pleased, provided they confined their ministry to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; but these were sent in pairs to prepare for their Master in the several places he intended to visit on his way to Jerusalem. Both commissions were ushered in with the remark, that the harvest was plenteous, but the labourers few; and the instruction was nearly the same; only the seventy, as the time assigned to them was short, were not to waste it by saluting any whom they might meet. As the Temple service was divided between Priests and Levites, under the superintendence of one high priest, some have fancied that the two orders of the Christian Ministry, presbyters and deacons, are represented by the twelve and the seventy. In the former we have the germ of Church government, but the latter was, I conceive, only temporary, and in no degree affects the Christian Ministry, which essentially differs from the Jewish Priesthood. The bond of Jewish unity was a Priest, who presided over a system of sacrifices which were continually offered from year to year. The bond of Christian unity is the High Priest after the order of Melchisedec, whose *one sacrifice of himself perfected for ever them that are sanctified.* Their principle of unity

was visible and material, ours invisible and spiritual. The remark unhappily cannot be extended to Romanists, as in their Pope, that is, Father, they acknowledge a visible universal Governor of the Church, who while he claims an Aaronitic Priesthood, assumes the pagan title of Supreme Pontiff.

81. *He attends the Feast of Tabernacles, and teaches in the Temple. John vii.*

Jesus had not visited Jerusalem for eighteen months^s; and some of his brethren, who did not as yet believe in him, taunted him with his continued absence, and his preaching and performing miracles in places comparatively obscure. Another opportunity of visiting the capital was offered by the Feast of Tabernacles. Jesus, to avoid needless offence by the attendance of a multitude of followers, would not accompany them, but went up, *as it were in secret*, neither preaching, nor working miracles by the way. About the middle of the feast he entered the Temple, and taught. The leading persons enquired, with a mixture of surprise and contempt, how he had attained sufficient knowledge of the Law to qualify him for a public instructor, since he had not received a liberal education. His doctrine, he replied, was not his own, as men acquire knowledge by study, but a message which he was commissioned to deliver, and that the preparation of mind for receiving it consisted (not in abilities or learning, but) in a desire to do the will of him who had sent him; so that every one that was thus inclined, would be enabled to form a correct opinion of his claims. He added, as a criterion, that the teacher who comes forward of his own accord, in one form or other pursues his own interest; whereas he who disregards self, and seeks only

^s In this and in other portions of St. John's Gospel I have derived much instruction from the translation of Tittman's Commentary.

God's glory, proves himself to be in reality, what he claimed to be, God's messenger. He exposed their insincerity by observing, that none of them kept the Law for which they affected so much zeal ; and that they were even then meditating a flagrant breach of it,—*Why go ye about to kill me?* Their motive was, his violation of the Sabbath, on his last visit, by healing the cripple at Bethesda. He required them to judge fairly, and if they did not scruple to circumcise on the Sabbath, not to condemn him for restoring on that day a man to the use of his limbs. The argument appears to have had its proper effect upon the more candid. Some even ventured to think, that as he spake so boldly, and was not opposed by the rulers, even they might believe him to be the Messiah. Others doubted, because they supposed they knew whence Jesus was, and they had been taught that *when Messiah cometh, no man knoweth whence he is.* The remark surprises us, because the priests, of whom king Herod enquired his birth-place, answered without hesitation ; and in the course of the next conversation, some recollecting that the Scripture said, that *he cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem.* The whence then must mean, not from what town, but what parents ; and his answer seems to say, You know my reputed father, but not my real one. *Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am? and I am not come of myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not.* Alarmed at his increasing popularity, as many seemed disposed to acknowledge him, by saying, *Can the Messiah do greater miracles?* the Pharisees and chief-priests now made their first attempt to seize him ; but unintimidated, he continued to speak, obscurely intimating his approaching decease, telling them that he was yet to stay a little longer with them, till he should go to him who had sent him ; and they would then seek him, but in vain, for where he should be, they would not be able to come. Not comprehending

his meaning, they asked if he would visit their countrymen dispersed among the Gentiles, and even teach the Gentiles themselves. The arrival of the officers probably ended the discourse.

Undaunted, on the last and greatest day of the festival, Jesus again came forward, and more explicitly declared himself, inviting, in an allusion to Isaiah's prophecy, every one that thirsted, to come and drink, describing himself as the spring of living water, in opposition to the cisterns constructed by men. The sacred Biographer informs us, that this is a reference to the gift of the Holy Spirit; and his words, *he that believeth on me as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water*, teach us, that it will not only be communicated to satisfy the believer's own thirst for spiritual blessings, but will be, as he told the woman of Samaria, a spring within him, whence streams will flow for the cleansing and refreshing of others. The reference being general, we cannot tell to what text in particular he referred; for there are several passages in the Prophets which convey the meaning, though not in these precise terms. His words derived a peculiar energy from the occasion upon which they were spoken; for upon this day it had become a custom to fetch water from the spring Siloam, which issued from a rock beneath the Temple; and this was partly drunk with joyful acclamations, partly poured over the evening sacrifice, the people singing Isaiah's words^t, *with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation*. This was said to have originated as a memorial of the miracle which relieved the thirst of their forefathers in the desert; and it was brought as a drink offering to supplicate for rain against the approaching seed time. Modern Jews allow it to be emblematical of the Holy Spirit; their ancestors therefore could hardly have misunderstood Jesus. The people were divided in their opinion of him; some main-

^t Isaiah xii. 3.

tained that he was the Prophet who was expected as the Messiah's harbinger; others, that he was the Messiah himself; while there were those who asserted, that as the Messiah was to spring from David, and to be born at Bethlehem, this Galilean could not be the expected King of Israel; so ignorant were they of the lineage and birthplace of Jesus. The officers themselves were too much impressed with what he had spoken to seize him; and Nicodemus ventured to suggest, that a man ought not to be condemned without a trial; so they all withdrew to their own homes, without coming to any determination, and Jesus retired to the Mount of Olives.

82. *A woman^a, taken in the act of adultery, is brought before Jesus, who declines to condemn her as a Judge, but as a Teacher admonishes her to sin no more. John viii. 1—11.*

The enemies of Jesus, having failed in their late attempt to take him by force, concerted a specious plan to ensnare him; and accordingly very early the next morning, when he had returned to teach, they brought in an adulteress, whose guilt was undeniable, since she had been taken in the very act, committed perhaps in some apartment of the Temple, which on this festival used to be turned into a scene of revelry. They observed, that Moses had commanded that such offenders should be stoned, and desired to have his decision. Their question was a dilemma, from

^a I have observed in the Introduction, that this narrative has been from an early age suspected of being an interpolation. It certainly is not noticed by the Greek commentators; nor does it appear in the principal ancient versions, and the text differs very greatly in its readings in the MSS. which contain it. Modern critics endeavour to show, that the style is unlike that of St. John; and yet even these, as Tittmann and Tholuck, are satisfied that it is not an invention, but a genuine tradition, which, being written on the margin, was transferred afterwards to the text; and the latter allows that the spirit of it is in perfect harmony with the essence of Christianity.

which there seemed to be no escape. Had he ordered them to put the law in force, they would have accused him to the Governor of assuming independent authority; and if he had referred them to his tribunal, they would have represented him to the people as a partisan of Rome, a betrayer of their liberties, and a despiser of their lawgiver. To show his unwillingness to interfere, he stooped down, and wrote with his finger on the ground, as was the custom of the Rabbis, when they did not choose to be disturbed. As, however, they would take no denial, he unmasked them by saying, *Let him among you who is without sin cast the first stone;* it being the custom for the witness to do this when a criminal was to be put to death. He thereby intimated, that they themselves were guilty of the very sin for which they brought the woman to be judged; for so we must understand ἀναμάρτητος, *he who is without that sin;* for confessedly none are without any; nor would a general charge come so powerfully home to the conscience. It was, as Jesus complained on another occasion, both literally and figuratively, *an adulterous generation;* and this interpretation is confirmed by the fact, if it be truly reported, that adultery was then so common, that the practice of trying by the waters of jealousy women suspected of it had been abolished; the trial according to the rabbinical comment being considered effectual, only when the husband was innocent. Jesus then stooped down to write a second time, perhaps to show that he had dismissed the case, and thus gave them an opportunity of withdrawing, *and they all,* convicted by their conscience, *went out, one by one.* Their scheme failed, and their hypocrisy was exposed. With consummate wisdom, he thus defeated their malice, without seeming to know it; and as he had before refused to divide an inheritance between two brothers^x, so now he evaded the office of a Judge, which they would have thrust

^x Luke xii. 14.

upon him, without losing sight of the Moralist; for to the guilty party he said, *Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more.* The accusers had disappeared, and no trial could take place; still in dismissing her, he both showed his knowledge of her guilt, and exhorted her to amend her conduct; as Augustine says, he did condemn, but it was the sin, not the sinner.

83. *The discourse, in which Jesus declares his own existence before the birth of Abraham, is abruptly terminated by an attempt of his auditors to stone him. John viii. 12—59.*

Jesus is said to have been *left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.* The people therefore (though her accusers had gone) remained, and as he had been teaching, he resumed after this interruption his discourse. The sun probably then rising, suggested to him the simile of his being *the Light of the world*, who not only enlighteneth, like that material luminary, but giveth life, intimating that in due time it will not only shine upon Israel, but upon all nations. The Pharisees objected, that as he bore witness to himself, his witness was not to be received. He replied, that it was valid, because he knew the nature of his mission, which they from their prejudices were not able to comprehend; and he added, (as he had told them before,) that he had moreover his Father's witness to the fact of his being the Light of the world, which with his own testimony, according to the decision of their law, was sufficient. He warned them of the consequences of their rejection of him, *Ye shall die in your sins, if ye believe not that I am [he].* They asked in return, seeking rather grounds of accusation, than to ascertain the truth, who he is? and he answered, *The same as I said unto you from the beginning* (of the discourse), *the Light of the world.* Alluding obscurely to the mode in which they would put him to death, he affirmed, *When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then ye shall know that I am [he].* In

both passages, *he* is the addition of the translators, and is, I apprehend, correct, for *he*, though meaning the Messiah, is ambiguous; and had his speech not been ambiguous, they would not in return have asked, *Who art thou?* His reply showed that he was faithful to his commission. *The Father hath not left me alone, for I do always those things that please Him.* Many, in consequence of the words, believed on him; and to encourage them he replied, that if they continued in this belief, they would know the Truth, and the Truth would make them free. They—I suppose others of his auditors—mistaking the moral slavery of which he spake for political, angrily yet falsely answered, that they were the *seed of Abraham, and were never in bondage.* He allowed that they were descendants of Abraham, and yet not properly his seed, nor the sons of God, for if they had been Abraham's children, they would have imitated his conduct; and if God were their Father, they would love him, who came from God. He added, that they could not convict him of sin, [that is, of falsehood,] and yet they would not believe on him, because they were not from God. This provoked them to call him a Samaritan and a demoniac; but he calmly denied the charge, and said, *I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me.* He told them that their works showed that they were the children of another father, the devil, a manslayer from the beginning, and a liar. *Verily, verily,* he continued, *I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death;* meaning the second death, which alone deserves the name, eternal misery in the unseen world. They understood the doctrine, but misrepresented his meaning, exclaiming, *Now we know that thou art possessed by a demon. Art thou greater than our father Abraham, who is dead? Whom makest thou thyself?* Their question drew forth his memorable declaration, *Abraham longed^y to see my day; he saw it, and was glad;*

^y rejoiced, A. T.

confirmed and explained by his reply to the question which it provoked, *Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Verily, verily, before Abraham was, I am.*

Anti-trinitarians tell us, this means that he had been designated to his office before the existence of Abraham, a proposition which we cannot conceive would have been announced so solemnly, and which could not have given offence. The attempt of the Jews to stone him as a blasphemer for this speech, which he did not explain away, sufficiently proves that they understood him, and that he meant them to understand him, to speak of his personal existence before that of the father of their nation, and consequently of his divinity. Commentators in general maintain, that our Lord here assumes the incommunicable title by which the Deity announced himself to Moses, *I am that I am*; but the opinion appears to be erroneous, for on no other occasion did he make so positive a declaration to his enemies; and I cannot see why the ellipsis should not be filled up with *he*, as in the two preceding passages of this same discourse, and then his Divinity, though not affirmed, is implied, in *I am*; for if his existence had to be measured by time, as that of all created beings, he would have said, *I was*, but as he is *without beginning of days*, his existence is one *everlasting now*. If it be asked, when Abraham saw the day of Christ? we answer, when by faith he offered up his son, and received him back again, *εἰ παραβολῆς*^{*}, in a figure, which visibly represented to his senses the death and the resurrection of the victim, which Jehovah would provide, as a substitute for guilty men; The Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world.

The fury of his audience terminated the discourse abruptly, for *they took up stones to cast at him*. He eluded their malice, passing through the midst of them, rendering himself, it is supposed, invisible.

* Heb. xi. 19.

84. *He restores the sight of a man born blind.* John ix. x.

On leaving the Temple, the attention of Jesus was drawn to a beggar, by the question of his Apostles, whether his being born blind was owing to his own sin, or to that of his parents. The first supposition is explained by some, as a reference to his conduct in a former state of existence, as we are told that the Pharisees believed in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. By others, from an opinion derived from the struggle between Esau and Jacob, that an infant could sin before its birth. Our Lord by his reply dis-countenanced either alternative; declaring that it was for the purpose of manifesting the power of God. His addition, that he must work the works of him that sent him while it was day, implied that the peril from which he had just escaped, and to which he would again expose himself, should not deter him from running his appointed course. Accordingly he cured him, and as in the case of the former blind man, by the intervention of natural means, though such as could have no efficacy but what he was pleased to give them. He anointed his eyes with earth made out of his own saliva, and sent him to wash it off in the water of Siloam^a, (that is, *Sent,*) that well of salvation, to which he had referred at the feast of Tabernacles; which seems to be typical of himself, who was *sent* by God. The beggar was directed there, probably both to try his own faith, and to draw the attention of others to the miracle. None is more important, unless it be the resurrection of Lazarus, for it shows the malicious yet fruitless attempt of the rulers to disprove it, and the gradual growth of faith in the subject

* This pool is a considerable reservoir in the valley of Jehoshaphat, supplied with water by a subterranean channel, from another of much smaller dimensions, called the Fountain of the Virgin, a quarter of a mile above.

of it, who began with declaring Jesus to be a prophet, unintimidated by their questioning, and ended with confessing him as the Messiah. His neighbours brought him before the Council, who were divided; but the majority did not believe the report, treating it as a collusion, till they had examined his parents, who attested his former blindness, but out of fear, gave no opinion, referring to their son as of age to answer for himself; for it had been already decreed, that if any man confessed Jesus to be Messiah, *he should be put out of the synagogue*, that is, be excommunicated. The Council again called in the beggar, and said, *Give God the praise, we know that this man is a sinner^b*. His remarkable answer conveys an indirect reproof. *Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see.* They again attempted to confute him, by asking, *How opened he thine eyes?* and their attempt provoked him to say, *Wherefore would ye hear it again? will ye also be his disciples?* In their passion they reviled both him and Jesus, saying, that they knew not whence the latter was. The man whose faith had procured him sight, not satisfied with acknowledging the fact, stood forth as the defender of his Benefactor's moral character, when his parents were overawed, declaring that he could not be a sinner whom God had enabled to perform such a miracle as had never been accomplished before *since the world began*; and that if he were not from *God, he could do nothing*. Disappointed in their hope of convicting him of imposture, or at least of silencing him, they in their resentment excom-

^b The advice may mean, Thank God for the recovery of thy sight, though it cannot be ascribed to the agency of one who is a sinner; but the answer, *Whether he be a sinner or not, I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see*, favours the suggestion, that it is an exhortation to him to confess the deception, in the words in which Joshua (vii. 19.) called upon Achan to acknowledge his guilt.

municated him, as they had threatened any who confessed Jesus to be the Messiah, and thus deprived him of any hope of future alms; but he, whom he had the courage to defend, would not suffer the honesty of this first sufferer in his cause to lose its reward. Finding him afterwards, he asked if he believed in the Son of God; and to his reply, *Who is he, Lord, that I might believe in him?* answered by revealing himself to him without any reserve. The beggar declared his belief, and worshipped him. Upon this Jesus observed, *I am come into this world for judgment, that those who see not might see, and that those who see might be made blind.* This judicial blindness, as he declared to some of the Pharisees who were present, and arrogantly asked if they were blind also, arose, not from an incapacity of seeing, but from their wilful closing of their eyes. *Now ye say we see, therefore your sin remaineth.*

The Sanhedrim had presumed to declare Jesus to be a sinner, that is, an impostor. He therefore went on to show, (for I consider the following chapter to be a continuation of the same discourse,) that these his calumniators were unworthy of the name of shepherds, being, in fact, thieves and robbers, and that he alone was *the good Shepherd*, and that such a *Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.* He represented himself also as the gate of a sheepfold, which in those countries, where it is necessary to take precautions against wild beasts, is of a more substantial construction, than with us; and as it was through the *door* that the *shepherd entereth,* while they that came *but for to steal, to kill, and to destroy,* *climb up* over the fence; so he was the only entrance into the congregation, and those who entered through him should *be preserved, and find pasture.* He then reverted to the figure of the shepherd, who is the owner of the sheep, and contrasted his own readiness to *lay down his life for them,* with the cowardice and selfishness of *the hireling,* who flees in the hour of danger, and leaves the sheep a prey.

when *he seeth the wolf coming, because he is an hireling.* The Saviour declared his determination to die for the sheep; and obscurely intimated the conversion of the Gentiles, by saying, that he had *other sheep* whom *he must bring*, who also *shall hear his voice*, and that both shall be united into *one fold* under him, the *one Shepherd*. In the East, the shepherd is a character of far higher moral dignity than with us: there, instead of following, he walks before the sheep, to see if they may venture forth; he protects, and is ready to risk life for them; and his care is repaid by a corresponding attachment on their part. As here described, he knows them individually, *calling his own sheep by name^b*, and they *acknowledge his voice*, and *follow at his call*. When therefore Jesus says, *I am the good Shepherd*, we must, to enter at all into the force of the comparison, take these circumstances into consideration. Even then our conception of his character will be most inadequate, since a reference to the image in the Old Testament will raise us above all created beings, even to the Deity himself, for we there shall discover that the good Shepherd is no other than Jehovah. *Behold, says Isaiah^c, the Lord will come with*

^b A striking illustration of this language is afforded by Polybius, (xii.) who tells us, that "when strangers land in Corsica, the swine immediately run away, and flock to the sound of the horn blown by their keepers, who, instead of following their herds like the Greeks, go before them to some distance. We need not however go so far for this illustration of the text; for even on our own Dorsetshire downs, the same mode of the shepherd preceding his flock has been noted. We know that the good Shepherd was a favourite emblem with the early Christians, from its frequent occurrence on their sepulchral monuments in the Roman Catacombs. It was the custom in Greece for shepherds to give names to their sheep; (Longus iv.) and we learn from Mr. Hartley that it still prevails; for on desiring one of them to call a sheep, on his doing so it ran up to him with apparent pleasure; and he told him that many of them were still wild, and had not yet learned their names. Researches in Greece, p. 321.

^c Isaiah xl, 11.

strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: he shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom. And Jehovah himself says by the mouth of Ezekiel, *Behold I, even I, will both search my sheep, and seek them out; I will feed them in a good pasture^d.* Our Lord seems to intimate this important truth, when he calls the sheep *his own*. The Church, which he [God] *has purchased with his own blood^e*, is called in Scripture *his flock*; and Pastor is one of the titles of his ministers when considered as rulers, from whom he is distinguished by Paul as the *Great Shepherd^f*, and by Peter^g as the *Chief Shepherd*. He declared that his Father loved him, because he would lay down his life; and added, that no one could force it from him, and that he had power to resume it. The result of the discourse is a division; but those who asked if a demoniac can open the eyes of a blind man, for the time prevailed.

85. *The Seventy disciples return. Luke x. 17—20.*

The Seventy disciples returned, exulting in their power over evil spirits, which exceeded their expectations, the cure of diseases being alone comprehended in their commission. Their Master then enlarged it, by subjecting to them *all the power of the enemy*, but took the opportunity of directing their joy and thankfulness to the far higher privilege of having their *names written in heaven*. In the sermon on the Mount^h he had warned them, that many who have even cast out demons in his name will be rejected at the last day. How far more precious then is grace than gifts! Talents and learning in our age supply the place of miraculous powers; they avail to the edification of others, but effect not our own salvation. How awful the state, and how bitter will be the self-reproach, of all, who, after

^d Ezekiel xxxiv. 11, 13, 15. ^e Acts xx. 28. ^f Heb. xiii. 20.
^g 1 Peter v. 4. ^h Matt. vii. 22.

they have been the agents in saving others, shall be themselves cast away! Anticipating the fall of Satan from heaven, he expressed his thankfulness on the return of the Twelve, declaring that all things had been committed to him by his Father, and that they were highly favoured in being permitted to hear doctrines, and see miracles, which kings and prophets had in vain longed to witness. The result of their mission must have been satisfactory, since it drew from our Saviour this acknowledgment; *I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things*—the truths, which they had, though imperfectly, proclaimed—from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes: thanking him (I conceive according to the Hebrew idiom) not that these truths were rejected by the former, but that they were accepted by the latter. To the former, the intelligent of this world, whether in higher or lower life, who were disposed to cavil, and expected *signs*, and *wisdom*, their teaching, though it could not comprehend, as afterwards, the scandal of the cross, proved a *stumbling-block* and *foolishness*; while the latter, teachable and humble, would be taught by God, and find it to be *his power and wisdom unto salvation*. The same expressions of gratitude are recorded by Matthew, when Jesus invited the weary and heaven laden to come unto him for refreshment: and harmonists in general assume, that though that Evangelist thought fit to introduce them in that connection, they were spoken only on this occasion. I agree with those who think the miracles, reported by more than one Evangelist, when they differ only in circumstances, to be the same, but I see no reason to apply the rule to words, especially to short sayings, which there might have been a propriety in repeating. We have read that the appointment of the Twelve and of the Seventy was introduced by the same appropriate remark, that *the harvest was plenteous, but the labourers few*; and we may reasonably suppose, that

this thanksgiving, and also the denunciation of a heavier judgment upon Chorazin and Bethsaida than upon Tyre and Sidon, and upon Capernaum than upon Sodom, were twice uttered.

86. *A Lawyer is taught the extent of his duty to his neighbour, by the example of a benevolent Samaritan. Luke x. 25—37.*

While Jesus was teaching, a lawyer, with the design of tempting him, asked what he should do in order to obtain eternal life. He referred him to the Law, of which he was an expounder, to find an answer for himself; and on his quoting the two leading precepts of love to God and love to his Neighbour, that epitome of our duty, which our Lord himself had repeated on a former occasion, he allowed that he had answered correctly, and had only to fulfil them and live. He who loves God at all times with all his capability of heart and mind, and every man with whom he has any concern as himself, has kept the Law, and instead of coming to his Creator as a suppliant for mercy, may appeal to his justice for a recompense. But who of the fallen sons of Adam will presume to rest his hope of acceptance upon this covenant of works? If any one could in his own strength keep the whole moral Law, having no sins that require expiation, the precious blood of the incarnate Son of God need not to have been shed for him. The mere statement of such a supposition confutes it. It is plain, then, that our Saviour's design was to lead this lawyer to a discovery of the extent of the Law which must be laid open to him, before he could feel his want of a more complete righteousness than his own: and it should seem that he suspected his design, from the Evangelist's adding, *seeking to justify himself.* Accordingly he asked who was his neighbour, passing over his duty to God, from the consciousness perhaps that his performance of that

would less bear a scrutiny. The Israelites, with the advantage of a revealed Law which breathes the spirit of benevolence, and expressly inculcates the relief of the stranger, had so narrowed their definition of neighbour, as to exclude from it all but their countrymen; while the Roman dramatist, with no more than the light of nature, could perceive, that no human being ought to be indifferent to man. Jesus did not point out how imperfectly the Jews acted up to the commandment, even within the pale which they had drawn round it; nor did he even directly answer the question, but he showed how a man of benevolence would have answered it, by relating what is called the parable of the good Samaritan. There is however no reason why it should not have been a real narrative; and certainly if considered, not only as what ought to be done, but as what had been done, it is much more impressive both as an example, and as a reproof. He described a traveller stripped and wounded, lying half dead upon the road between Jerusalem and Jericho, which was infested by *robbers*¹. Three persons are brought forward, a Priest, a Levite, and a Samaritan; the two former with peculiar propriety, as it was a city where many of them were stationed with a view to their temple service: the first two, honourable in the eyes of his auditors; the last, despicable. From the Priest and the Levite, as teachers of the Law and ministers of religion, they might have expected the performance of one of its plainest precepts; but the first would not even look upon his suffering countryman; the second came up to him, but, whether from indifference or fear of the robbers, instead of assisting him, also pursued his way: while this excommunicated and abhorred alien, from whom a Jew would anticipate neither assistance nor pity, and whom in distress he would himself have disregarded, alone fulfilled the commandment, by doing as he would be done by. He treated the

¹ λῃσταὶ, not *thieves*.

unfortunate traveller according to the then approved method^k, by pouring into his wounds the oil and wine which he had provided for his own use; he underwent fatigue, and exposed himself to danger, by dismounting to set him upon his beast, and took care of him at the inn; leaving with the host two denarii, fifteen of our pence, (about the pay of a soldier and a labourer^l for two days,) which might be all the money he had. Nor was he content to trust to the benevolence of the host, but promised, if the sum was not enough, on his return to make up the deficiency. Had their situations been reversed, and a Jew been introduced as relieving a distressed Samaritan, prejudice might have prevented the lawyer's cordial approbation of this act of charity; but as the sufferer was his countryman, his sympathy was awakened, and Jesus drew from him an acknowledgment, that this despised stranger had acted like a neighbour, while both Levite and Priest had failed in their duty. Thus he made him teach himself, that in this instance which he himself had chosen, the demand of the law was more extensive than he had imagined. His object was to show the nature and the extent of beneficence, and that our relief of the distressed should be as complete as is in our power, universal, and not limited to our own countrymen, or to the members of our own Church.

The lesson is most valuable; and has been eminently efficacious both in enlarging charity and repressing bigotry: yet many expositors, from the fathers to the modern com-

^k This treating with oil, and that poured in hot, in consequence of which the majority of those wounded by gun shots died, prevailed universally in the European armies, till superseded by Ambrose Parée, that distinguished Surgeon to the French kings, who being a Protestant would have perished in the St. Bartholomew's massacre, had he not been saved from it by the contrivance of Charles IX. himself.

^l Matt. xx. 2. Tacitus, A. 1—17.

mentors, not content with the obvious instruction, seek in this and in other parables, a recondite meaning. They take the good Samaritan for a figurative representation of our Lord, and the traveller for human nature wounded by sin, whom the Law would not relieve, and who must perish without the Gospel. This is an allegory which piety can render edifying, as may be seen in a sermon on the subject by Bishop Horne, but it does not follow that it was designed; and when I consider the difficulty of spiritualizing the pence and the far-fetched application of other circumstances, I am disposed to regard it not as an interpretation, but as an ingenious accommodation. Such a kind of exposition, unless guarded as such, appears to me objectionable, not only as precarious and liable to abuse, but as perplexing the reader with an additional meaning, which will end in rendering the sense of Scripture uncertain, and so depriving it of its authority as a rule. It has a tendency to draw us off from practical precepts to articles of faith, which are taught with more certainty in other passages; and a lively fancy may also mislead this class of interpreters, and so error be received which, without this sanction, would be rejected. And this very narrative is a memorable instance that the evil is not imaginary, for from it has been derived the tenet as well as the name of *Supererogation*. According to Roman Catholic divines, the Samaritan, in bringing the stranger to the inn and giving the two pence, had fully discharged his duty; he therefore did more than he was bound to do in promising to pay his future expenses; and as his speech, Προσδαπανήσεις, *What thou shalt expend more*, is rendered in the Latin Testament *Supererogaveris*, his voluntary bounty, which exceeded his duty, obtained the name of *Supererogation*. The notion that man, who has nothing but what he has received from his Creator, can do more than his duty, is so preposterous, that it seems to one who hears it for the first time impossible that it could have been

ever seriously entertained; and perhaps it might never have prevailed, unless it had been first recommended as an interpretation of Scripture.

87. *Jesus again teaches his disciples to pray, and illustrates by a parable the efficacy of persevering prayer. Luke xi. 1—13.*

The disciples having again requested Jesus to teach them how to pray, he gave them that well-known form, which from his giving it, is denominated the Lord's Prayer. It is recorded here by Luke, and by Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount, and in the opinion of most harmonists was given on two occasions. Here it is certainly given as a form; and perhaps, *Pray after this manner*, οὕτως, the direction in the first Gospel, may convey the same meaning, though it is taken by others, according to the English idiom, as a model to direct us in forming our petitions. The use of the plural number shows that it is designed for social worship, and the Church has universally introduced it into its Liturgies; but the superstitious abuse of it by Roman Catholics, who repeated it rather as a charm than as a statement of their wants and desires, has driven some Protestants into the opposite extreme; so that though permitted by the Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, it has only been used of late in the Kirk of Scotland, or by the majority of English dissenters. A great ornament of that body, the amiable and candid Doddridge, exclaims in his Family Expositor, “Excellent is this form of sound and divine words, which our great Master here recommends. God forbid that any of his followers should censure their brethren who think it still proper to use it, not only as a directory, but as a form too.” And we may add, Let us, in whose liturgy it so frequently recurs, beware lest we suffer it to sink into a lifeless form; and let us attentively study it, that our thoughts and our desires may go along

with its petitions. Some even of our own communion object, that it is repeated too often in our Prayer Book. The fault, if it be one, is not to be ascribed to those who compiled it, but to those who have united together three Services originally distinct: and in these it recurs only on a break in our devotions, as after the second Lesson, and after partaking of the Sacrament, upon the principle that we should never have a continuous course of prayer without introducing it. Matthew has, *this day*; Luke, *day by day*; and substitutes *sin* for *debt*, as more intelligible to Gentiles. The two Evangelists give it with considerable variation; the former puts forgiveness as a condition, *Forgive us as we forgive*; the latter as a reason, *For we forgive*. Luke omits the Doxology; which some critics suppose was not in the original text of Matthew, but interpolated from an early Liturgy. It is found, however, in the Syriac version, but not in the Vulgate, or some of the best Greek manuscripts. Accordingly it does not occur in the Roman Liturgy, and appears in ours only in that opening portion of our daily service that has been derived from a Protestant^m source, and after the reception of the Eucharist. It must be allowed to be a most appropriate termination, since it assigns the reason for prayer, the ability of God to grant it, and suits especially the last petition, deliverance from the evil Spirit.

Our Saviour in this prayer most impressively teaches, that the glory of God, whom he authorizes us to address as a Parent, should be dearer to us even than necessary food; for as in the Sermon on the Mount, when exhorting his

^m The commencement of the Service, that is, the Sentences and Confession and Absolution, was added in King Edward's Second Book. The idea was taken from Calvin's Liturgy, but was immediately borrowed from that published by Polanus, the Minister of the Refugee German clothiers, who were settled by the Duke of Somerset at Glastonbury.

disciples to seek the reign of God and his righteousness in the first place, he assures them, that whatever is necessary for their bodily wants shall be added to them; so here he does not permit them to ask even for *daily*, or *sufficient*ⁿ, food, till they have prayed that his Name may be sanctified, the reign of his grace be universally established, and his will accomplished by men with the same willingness as by angels. The last petition is too often understood only passively, and offered up as a petition for resignation under distressing, though fatherly, chastisements, as if it were equivalent to our Lord's personal supplication, *Father, not my will, but thine be done.* But this idea, though included in the petition, is far from exhausting it; since it also expresses a desire, that all the faculties and means possessed by men should be actively engaged for accomplishing the purposes of God with as much alacrity, as is done by those perfect intelligences that *excel in strength, and fulfil his commandment.* The first three petitions are for the promotion of the glory of God; the others for ourselves, for necessary daily maintenance, for forgiveness, on the express condition of our forgiving, and for preservation from temptation or trial, and deliverance in it from sin, or

ⁿ *Daily*, in connection with *this day*, seems to add little force as an epithet to bread. It is our version of *ἐπιούσιον*, which occurs nowhere else, and is rendered *quotidianum* in the old Italic, but literally by Jerome *supersubstantiale*; a word probably invented by him for the purpose, which seems to mean *sufficient*, and appears to me to give the true sense, which thus becomes equivalent to Agur's petition, *Feed me with bread convenient for me.* (Prov. xxx. 8.) Others render it *to-morrow's bread*; but this, though it may be in a degree supported by Luke's *day by day*, does not seem in harmony with the precept, *Take no thought for the morrow.* Bread is, we perceive, continually used for food in the New Testament: *As he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath-day.* (Luke xiv. 1.) *Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of heaven.* (Luke xiv. 15.)

rather from the Devil, the instigator to sin: for the original word, which may be rendered either *evil*, or the *evil Being*, in this connection best suits the latter. The prayer is concluded with a doxology, in which we declare our conviction that our heavenly Father is able to grant our requests, as we ascribe to him *the kingdom, and the power, and the glory*. We previously pray that his kingdom, that is reign, may come; it is clear then that the word is here used in a different sense; there it means the kingdom of his grace, his sovereignty over his people; here, that of his providence, by which he governs all things and persons, and makes even his enemies subservient to his pleasure. Jesus, having taught his disciples how to pray, encouraged them by the example of others to persevere in the duty, and not to give it up because their request was not immediately granted, showing, first by a parable, the success of importunity, in exhorting a loan of food from a reluctant friend; and secondly, by arguing *à fortiori*, that if an earthly father will not disappoint his son's reasonable request, though he be comparatively wicked, much more will their heavenly and perfect Parent grant to them that ask him the *Holy Spirit*^o, the desire of whose blessed influence he has himself excited in them. This importunity or *shamelessness*, *avædia*, is a comment upon our Lord's declaration, that *the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force*. As the petition is for another's benefit, it particularly encourages intercessory prayer; and its efficiency is shown by the friend not sending one of his household, but coming himself, and giving not only what was asked, but as much as was needed.

^o In the corresponding verse, (Matt. vii. 11.) it is δόματα ἀγαθά, *good gifts*, which shows how one Evangelist can be made the interpreter of another.

88. *Jesus makes straight on a sabbath-day a woman who had been bowed together for eighteen years. Luke xiii. 10—17.*

We have now another miracle recorded, performed in a synagogue on the sabbath day; and the same objection, raised by his opponents as on a former occasion, is silenced in the same manner by an appeal to their own practice. *Thou hypocrite*, replied Jesus, marking thereby the character of the ruler of the synagogue, *doth not each of you loose his ass or bull, and lead it away to watering on the sabbath-day?* Now this was attended with some labour, and was only done to preserve an animal from the uneasiness of thirst; could it then be a question with them, whether or not it was fit on that day to loose from an infirmity of eighteen years' standing a daughter of Abraham? We may presume, that the phrase was chosen to intimate, that she was not only, like them all, descended from the patriarch, but also a partaker of his faith. His answer shamed his adversaries into silence, while the multitude rejoiced in his glorious displays of power. The ruler had exclaimed with indignation, that the sick ought to come on the week days to be healed; but we have no reason to suppose that this woman came for that purpose; she came, we may presume, to worship God, which, to her who was bowed almost double, must have been a self-denying labour; and while she was seeking spiritual improvement, it pleased her compassionate Saviour to restore her body to straightness and vigour. The objection of the ruler was most unreasonable; for to establish against Jesus the charge of breaking the sabbath, he must have interpreted his laying of hands upon the woman as a work.

89. *His reply to the question, of the number that will be saved; and his declaration, that he should be put to death in Jerusalem.* Luke xiii. 23—35.

As Jesus was travelling, he was asked if the number of the saved would be few: and, according to his custom, he availed himself of the question, to introduce a profitable conversation. Without satisfying an idle curiosity as to others, he exhorted them to secure their own entrance into heaven, telling them, that many would in vain seek admission, and that they must strive, that is, make every effort, and force, as it were, a passage through the narrow gate. Thus we learn from the highest authority, what yet few seem disposed to believe, that notwithstanding conviction, temporary earnestness, and partial reformation, many will at last come short of salvation. The causes of failure are as various as the temptations that beset us; still procrastination alone will be fatal; for no one will be rejected that applies while opportunity is afforded, or (as it is figuratively expressed) *till the Master of the house is risen up, and hath fastened the door.* But as the hour of death is unknown to us, and ill adapted for preparing for eternity, we should, instead of abusing mercy, and despising the *long-suffering of God, which leadeth to repentance,* act upon our Lord's advice in another place: *Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh.* And if he should not come in our day, he will call us out of the world by death, and our departure to him will be practically the same as his advent to us. Our Lord here so expresses himself, as to teach, that many Jews, who thought their admission into the kingdom of God certain, would be rejected, as workers of iniquity, while Gentiles from every land should sit down with their father Abraham, and those of his descendants after the flesh, who were worthy, as Isaac, Jacob, and the Prophets.

Jesus was still within Galilee, Herod's jurisdiction, and was warned by certain of the Pharisees to depart, because that sovereign was desirous of killing him. Their motive does not appear; but their advice was not followed. He told them to inform the Tetrarch, who perhaps only wished to frighten him to a distance, and whose craft he designated by calling him a fox, that he should proceed in his active course of beneficence for his appointed time; and that when that was finished, he should be put to death, not in his dominions, but in Jerusalem, which had shed the blood of the ancient prophets, and was thus *to fill up the measure of its iniquity*. This recollection of his destined place of suffering, however, excited not his resentment but his pity; and he spoke of his willingness to shelter and protect her inhabitants with the affection of the maternal bird to her brood, not only now, but often; referring, it should seem, to earlier periods of their history, before his incarnation. Language such as this, inexplicable in the mouth of a mere human teacher, is most suitable to the God of Israel, whom Moses^p compares to an eagle *who stirreth up her nest*, to stimulate her young to exertion, *fluttereth over* them to incite them to try their power of flying, and *beareth on her wings*. And David, when *the wicked, as deadly enemies, compassed him about*, prayed, *Hide me under the shadow of thy wings*^q. The bird alluded to in the Gospel (rendered in this passage in the Vulgate *Gallina*) is probably the hen; and Euripides^r, who employs the same simile, expresses, what here must be understood, that the bird protects her young at the risk of her life. Both images are eminently characteristic of him, who is at once *our Guide unto death, and a Shield unto them that put their trust in him*. As the eagle, he will lead his people in the *waste howling wilderness*; as the hen, he is *a strong tower, the righteous runneth into it, and is safe*. He had

^p Deut. xxxii. 11.

^q Psalm xvii. 8.

^r Herc. Furens 71.

long besought them through his prophets, he now besought in person, as did after his departure his Apostles; but all laboured in vain; they would not listen to the invitation, their ruin therefore was wholly from themselves. He then solemnly announced, that the imprecation of the Psalmist^s, speaking in his person, *Let their habitation be desolate*, was about to be verified in the fate of the nation; and drew their attention to the wonderful prophecy of his sufferings and triumph, in the 118th Psalm, by declaring, that they should see him no more till they were willing to hail him as the Messiah, by exclaiming in its words, *Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord.*

90. *Jesus dines with a Pharisee on a Sabbath, and relates the parable of a Supper, which those who had been invited excused themselves from attending. Luke xiv. 1—24.*

The Jewish Sabbath, not only, as originally instituted, but even with all the additional regulations of the traditional Law, was not so burthensome as we are apt to suppose. The nation scrupulously abstained from whatever the most rigid interpreter could show to be a manual work; and the kindling of a fire, and the dressing of victuals on it, are expressly forbidden by Moses; yet still it was not a fast, but a feast. A chief Pharisee, who is called a Ruler, a member therefore of the Sanhedrin, invited our Lord to dine with him on that day, and he did not scruple to attend. It appears to have been a grand entertainment, to which many had been previously invited; and Michaelis conjectures, that it was a feast of tenths and first-fruits, which, he thinks, throws light upon a part of the conversation. The Law, in addition to the tithe assigned to the Levites, required a second to be presented as a thank-offering at the great festivals; and the flesh of the animals in those sacrifices in which it was lawful to eat it, after deducting

^s Psalm lxix. 25.

what was to be burned, and the portion of the priests, was appropriated to entertainments, to which were to be invited the stranger, the widow, and the orphan. The day was not divided by the Jews as by us, but commenced with sunset; and began with the principal meal, which might be plentiful, without in any degree interfering with the rest of the sabbath, as it would have been already prepared. A man who had the dropsy happened to be present, and our Saviour first asked the company, if it were lawful to heal upon the sabbath. They were silent, for they did not dare to say that the Law forbade their doing good on that day, so he laying his hand on him, healed and dismissed him. He might, as in many other instances, have effected the cure by a word, but he preferred an action, though as little laborious as possible, to reprove their superstition and malignity, which he did by the comparison which he had so lately used in the synagogue.

Observing the Lawyers and Pharisees contending for precedence, he reproved their love of distinction in language like Solomon's^t, *Put not forth thyself in the presence of the king, and stand not in the place of great men; for better it is that it be said unto thee, Come up hither, than that thou shouldest be put lower in the presence of the prince whom thine eyes have seen.* Then, turning to his host, he recommended him when he made an entertainment not to invite his rich relations and neighbours, who would ask him in return, but those to whom it would be an act of charity. We are not to take the advice so literally as to abjure all exercise of hospitality, which would be in opposition to the social feelings which God hath implanted in us, not to be extirpated but to be regulated, and was sanctioned by him on other occasions, as well as inculcated by his Apostles. But it teaches us, that we cannot innocently expend so much in entertainments to our acquaintance, as to deprive us of

^t Psalm xxv. 6, 7.

the power of making due provisions for the wants of the distressed; and that we may confidently affirm is not due provision, which does not cause some self-denial. Neither is it required in the present state of society, that *the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind*, should be guests at our table. The spirit of the precept is preserved, if we provide them with dinners at their homes, and the command, like those of requiring mercy and not sacrifice, and of hating our father and mother, may be considered, according to the well-known Hebrew idiom, merely as representing, that the relieving the distressed ought to take precedence of social entertainments.

His declaration, that such should be recompensed at the resurrection of the just, led one of the company to exclaim, how blessed it would be to eat and drink in the kingdom of God; when, to show how little this blessing was really coveted, though men might fancy they desired it, he spoke a parable, in which the rejection of the Gospel by different characters is exhibited under the figure of a feast, which the persons, who had been invited, on various reasons, declined to attend. To understand its scope, we must recollect that the invitation did not find them engaged, but had been previously accepted. It is material also to observe, that they did not plead amusement, but business. Their occupations were lawful, and proper; but their perverseness appeared by their pursuing them at an improper season; and an undue attachment to things in themselves innocent, and even requiring attention, may be found at last, more than positive sin, to have been the ruin of the majority of mankind. All the invited having excused themselves, *the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind*, were brought in from the streets and the lanes, at the command of the Master of the feast, but yet there was room; so he ordered his servants to go into the highways and hedges, that his house may be filled. Those who rejected the feast were the leading characters of the Jewish nation; the blind and lame are the

minority, *the publicans and harlots*, who, themselves scorned by their rulers and teachers, welcomed a despised Messiah; the third class, whom it might not be expedient to distinguish more clearly, are the Gentiles. But though this is the primary meaning, the parable will be found to apply with no less propriety to individuals in every age and country; to the self-righteous, who accept but neglect the invitation; the humble, who willingly consent, and the timid, who, feeling their unworthiness, are slow to believe that the invitation can be serious, and require therefore to be repeatedly pressed. Some commentators, who *know not what manner of spirit they are of*, have caught at the expression, *compel them to come in*, to support the anti-christian doctrine of persecution; but the fair inference from their strained interpretation of a single word in a parable, is the weakness of their cause, and the want of scriptural authority to support it; and it is evident, from the use of the original term ἀνάγκασθ^u on other occasions, that no other compulsion was designed than earnest entreaty, which indeed was all that one servant could use towards a multitude.

91. *He requires his disciples to love him more than their nearest relatives, and to be ready to forsake all that they have for his sake. Luke xiv. 25—35.*

Jesus next assured the great multitudes that went with him, that no man was able to be his disciple who suffered attachment to his relatives or to himself to interfere with his superior claims upon his love; and that, as his disciple must take up his cross, and be ready at his call to leave his family, his possessions, and occupations, a prudent man, before he engaged in such a service, would count the cost, and not expose himself to ridicule, like the thoughtless

^u *He constrained (ἠνάγκασεν) his disciples to go out into a ship.* Matt. xiv. 22. *Why compellest thou (ἀναγκάζεις) the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* Gal. ii. 14.

builder, who begins a tower without calculating if he have the means of finishing it; or the improvident Sovereign, who rushes upon war with one who is manifestly more powerful. Salt is good, but if it lose its saltness, it has no value, and is consequently thrown away; so the professing Christian, who has the form without the substance of religion, will be rejected as perfectly useless.

92. The Parables of the lost Sheep, of the lost Drachma, and of the Prodigal Son. Luke xv.

“The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual^x;” and therefore after his resurrection the Apostles were authorized to proclaim in his name, forgiveness to all the descendants of Adam. The cause, though indicated in the blood-shedding so often appointed in the Law, he did not himself reveal, but he continually invited sinners to come unto him; and by parable and by direct instruction, and above all in his form of prayer, he had shown the placability of his Father. This doctrine, peculiar to Christianity, which entitles it to its name of *Good Tidings*, ought to be thankfully received by all, since all, even those who have been regenerated, *offend in many things*^y, and deceive themselves if *they say they have no sin*^z. Still it has proved a stumblingblock to Christians as well as to Jews, and some of the former would restrict the grant to the washing away of sin at Baptism in the laver of Regeneration. Happily however there are many passages of Scripture announcing a full and free pardon, to those already in covenant with God, both under the old and the new dispensation; none of which is more encouraging than St. John’s declaration, that God *is faithful and just to forgive us our sins*; *faithful*, because he has promised; *just*, because his Son has borne the penalty of them. Our Church, therefore,

^x Art. xxxi.

^y James iii. 2.

^z 1 John i. 8.

rightly maintains, that “they are to be condemned who deny the place of forgiveness to such Christians as truly repent^a;” and in the third Homily, “that they which do sin after Baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, are washed by this Sacrifice from their sins in such sort, that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation.” The error seems to have originated from the apprehension, that the truth, if broadly stated, would be abused by the immoral. Perhaps it might not have prevailed so much, if it had been duly considered, that repentance is the indispensable condition of forgiveness, and that the blood of Christ not only obtains pardon, but *cleanses from all sin*. The redeemed are not only clothed with his imputed righteousness, but *they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb*, and have henceforward in consequence a righteousness of their own.

The murmuring of the Scribes and Pharisees, when publicans and notorious sinners drew near to hear him, gave occasion to our Lord to inculcate this doctrine, which he did in three parables. In the first two, he justified himself by the ordinary practice of mankind; for the Shepherd of a hundred sheep would leave his flock to recover one that had wandered from the fold; and a woman who possessed ten drachmas, if she lost one, would exert herself to recover it. Both would call upon their friends and neighbours to rejoice in their success; and he intimated how his conduct ought to have affected them by declaring, that in like manner one penitent sinner would be the cause of more joy to angels, than ninety-nine just persons that did not need repentance. Strictly speaking, there are none so just: this affirmation, therefore, has occasioned some perplexity, but surely without reason, as we are not to look for a theological axiom in such a speech, but take it as a popular expression, for such as are comparatively innocent. In these parables he shows

* Art. xvi.

the anxiety of the Son of Man *to seek and to save that which was lost.*

In a third, of a father and two sons, he delineates a sincere penitent, and contrasts his gracious reception by God with the harsh and uncharitable treatment of him by man. The narrative, brief as it is, like that of the Samaritan, is most beautiful as a composition, though its import is too weighty to suffer us to dwell upon such inferior considerations. The younger son seems to claim as a right a certain share of his father's property during his lifetime, in order to establish himself; as not having the same security for the future as the elder brother, whose inheritance would be greater. Thus Abraham had given his sons portions, and sent them away, keeping Isaac his heir at home. The depth of misery and the humiliation of the prodigal could not have been represented more impressively to a Jewish audience, than by the repulsive occupation to which he was reduced of keeping swine, and by his longing, from his scanty supply of food, to partake of the pods which were thrown to, and as it were defiled by, that unclean animal, which his education must have rendered to him, as to them, an object of aversion and disgust. His amendment is called, *coming to himself*, a term which expresses strikingly the absurdity and madness of *the excess of riot to which he had run*; and his language, reminding one of David's, *I have sinned against heaven*, shows the reality of his repentance; which is confirmed by his determination to return home. The infinite compassion of God, who is ever more ready to grant than man to ask, is represented by the affecting fact, that his father does not wait for his coming, but as soon as ever he sets out, runs to meet him, and instead of reproaching, embraces and kisses him. His confession of ingratitude and guilt is interrupted by an order given to one servant to exchange his rags for the best robe, and to another to kill the fatted calf, reserved for a feast. Thus the penitent

will not be upbraided by his heavenly Father, *for none of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him^b*, but *shall be cast into the depths of the sea^c*, and God will cause him to be arrayed in the robe of the Redeemer's righteousness, and will treat him not as a servant, the utmost the prodigal had ventured to solicit, but as a son. The arrival of this penitent is the signal for music and dancing, and in like manner the recovery of a lost sinner adds to the happiness of heaven. The father and his household rejoice in his return, but the elder brother repines at this kind reception, and even complains that his own constant and faithful service has never been recompensed by the smallest favour, while the greatest is lavished upon this prodigal. The two brothers are supposed by some commentators to represent the Jews and the Gentiles, and it is easy to trace a resemblance; but they misconceive the scope of the parable; for the context shows, that the prodigal represents the penitent sinner, such as frequently came to the Saviour while on earth; the elder brother the supercilious and self-approving pharisee, such as now surrounded him; and he is obviously speaking of sinners within the Church. The Gentile indeed was also in a far country, but he had not designedly gone there; and the object of the parable is not to show God's mercy to the Heathen, but the restoration to baptismal privileges of the lapsed Christian if penitent, though guilty of gross sins; a consolatory doctrine, rejected by some rigid divines, yet taught not only here, but directly in other passages, and especially by St. Paul, who commanded the Corinthian sinner to be readmitted into the Church, lest he should be *swallowed up with overmuch sorrow^d*. The parable has lost none of its force among the changes of manners that more than eighteen centuries have produced; for under every modification of religion we find the two characters here delineated.

^b Ezek. xxxiii. 16.

^c Micah vii. 19.

^d 2 Cor. ii. 7.

" Among the mistakes about repentance," observes Jortin, in a Sermon, " it is the notion, that a constant obedience is not to be preferred to the most sincere and active repentance." The truth of the observation no reasonable person will deny; but he begs the question, when he adds, that " the father, who at first rejoiced so greatly at the return of the prodigal, yet in his sedate judgment makes a wide difference between the penitent son and the innocent." We have no testimony to the merit of the latter but his own; and his sullenness and reproachful reply to his father, which are all that are recorded concerning him, seem to show a character proud of its freedom from gross sins, and certainly displeasure at the cordial forgiveness of a penitent brother. Self-examination, it is to be feared, will detect such a feeling latent in the hearts of many who have been preserved by God's providence, or restraining grace, from a similar course of wickedness. It is compatible with virtue, but the parable is a warning to subdue this evil propensity, which cannot be pleasing to him who rejoices over every soul that was lost and is found, and in a believer, as he advances in holiness and humility, will gradually die away. Macknight more justly remarks, that the goodness with which the father bore the surly peevishness of the elder brother, whom he still calls son notwithstanding his insolent speech, is little inferior to the mercy shown in pardoning the younger. The result of the father's remonstrance is not recorded. Publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of heaven before Pharisees, yet it is also open to them, and has been entered by some. This parable, therefore, may be in every age as useful to persons of such disposition, as to prodigals.

93. *The Parables of the Unjust Steward, and of the Rich Man and the Beggar. Luke xvi.*

Unbelievers have objected to the tendency of the parable of the unjust steward; and there are even Christians who find a difficulty in reconciling it with the perfect morality contained in whatever other instruction our Saviour has condescended to give. Numerous and strange expositions have consequently been suggested; yet one would think that none but prejudiced or very careless hearers could draw improper inferences from it; for he calls the steward unjust, and a child of this world, and points out its moral, so that even those who do not understand the reasoning, may take it upon his authority. Whenever the word *Lord* occurs, we are apt to think of our Redeemer; but it is not he, but the steward's lord, or master, that commends him; and this consideration will go far towards removing the objection, which would not have been felt in so great a degree in England, if *φρονίμως* had been rendered in the authorized version as it is by Wycliffe, *prudently* instead of *wisely*. An ancient rhetorician has observed, that "in comparisons it is not necessary that there should be a resemblance in the objects, but only in the qualities for the sake of which they are compared."^e Thus the poet likens his hero to a lion, merely that he may bring to our mind the idea of courage common to both: our Saviour compared himself to a thief, only on account of the unexpectedness of his coming; and in this parable he designs to recommend not dishonesty, but prudence. Accused, with reason, of wasting his master's property, not strong enough to dig, and too proud to beg, the object of the steward is his own maintenance, when he is turned out of his office. With this view he calls upon his master's debtors; (whether tenants who paid their rents in kind, or dealers who contracted to

^e Ad Herennium, iv.

supply the household with corn and oil, is immaterial;) and suggested such alterations in their contracts as would benefit them at his lord's expense. To one he remits half, to another only a fifth, of what is due; but these details I consider are introduced only to complete the narrative, without a specific signification. The means he employed were iniquitous, but they answered his end; and he is brought forward to show the greater sagacity of the children of this world than of the children of light; and to shame the latter for not pursuing their good aim—the securing a happy eternity—with the same consistency as he did his bad aim, the obtaining through unjust cunning a provision for this life. As the steward by these fraudulent dealings with the debtors secured to himself, when discarded, a temporary home, we are invited to make to ourselves friends out of our money, here called the *mammon of unrighteousness*, that when our stewardship is terminated by death, it may be the means of bringing us into *everlasting habitations*. The disciples being poor, might think themselves unconcerned in the parable; Jesus therefore assured them, that he who is faithful in the management of a little, will be faithful if entrusted with much; showing by the observation, that it could not be the faithlessness of the steward that he meant to recommend. He added, that *if they were not faithful in the unrighteous or false mammon, which is the property of another*, that is, of God, how could they expect that he would commit to their trust the *true*^f, which might be called their own, because it would not be committed to them as a temporary trust, for which they must render an account, but would be held by an unalienable tenure. The expression, *unrighteous mammon*, staggers many; but the perishable wealth of this world is so called by a figure, not because unrighteously acquired, as in the instance of the

^f The sense is obscured in our version by the adding *riches*, which, as the italics show, has no equivalent in the original.

steward, but because it is itself, so to speak, unrighteous towards its possessors, by deceiving them both in the enjoyments it promises, and in its fleeting nature, since often *riches make themselves wings and fly away*. And that this is its meaning appears, because mammon is opposed not to *righteous* but *true*; and unrighteous is also used in other places for what is false, and does not fulfil its promises. He concluded with the alarming declaration, that as no man can at the same time be faithful to two masters, it is impossible to reconcile the service of God and Mammon; and this personification of riches shows, that, as the Apostle says, the love of them is a kind of idolatry. *The fine gold* is not only inordinately valued, for the sake of what it can procure, but is by too many made *their confidence*, or mammon, for the word (a Syriac one for Plutus, the God of wealth) means that in which men trust; and thus in their estimation, it practically supersedes their reliance upon him, to whom *belong the silver and the gold*, by transferring it to what is only his gift, which they are too apt to ascribe to their own diligence, or good fortune, instead of to his Providence.

This parable was spoken to his disciples, but in the presence of the Pharisees, who were covetous, and derided him, and was followed up by a narrative addressed to them, which teaches that it is not enough to refrain from wasting our Master's property, and defrauding him like the unjust steward, but that we must be not only negatively innocent, but positively good, and spend to his glory the mammon which is not our own, but lent us by him, that hereafter he may receive it with interest. The condition of two men in this world and in the next are contrasted. The one had enjoyed a life of luxury; the other, lying at his porch full of ulcers, had endured a miserable existence. But after death, the beggar was *carried by the angels into the abode of the blessed departed spirits*, called here as it has been since by Jewish authors, *Abraham's bosom*, as those who rest there

are supposed to have been partakers of the patriarch's faith ; while the rich man is tormented in the division of Hades, assigned to the wicked, parted from that of the good by an impassable gulph. Their condition is now reversed ; Lazarus has become rich, the rich man poor, and the latter in his misery entreats the former to cool his burning tongue with one drop of water ; and when he is told by Abraham that his request cannot be granted, he in vain petitions that the same Lazarus may be sent to earth to warn his five surviving brethren, that they may escape the flames that torment him. The rich man's wealth does not appear to have been acquired unjustly, or to have been expended profligately ; it is only said, that he was clothed splendidly in the most expensive articles, *purple and fine linen*, and enjoyed himself *every day sumptuously* ; and Abraham upbraids him with no wicked abuse of his riches, not even with neglect of Lazarus, whom he probably relieved in a degree, (though not adequately,) or he would hardly have named him. He merely reminds him, that he had received his good things. We must also suppose, that Lazarus had lived a life of faith and resignation ; for poverty and misery alone can entitle none to admission into bliss. The parable therefore enforces and illustrates the guilt and punishment of him who lives exclusively to himself ; an awful truth, which many professing Christians can hardly be brought to acknowledge ; and in addition to its special object, it incidentally opposes the two contrary tenets of purgatory, and the sleep of the soul in the interval between death and the day of judgment. It shows, that the condition of men is unalterably fixed at death, and consequently that our Church has justly rejected the former tenet as a “fond thing vainly invented⁶ ;” while it guards us from the latter, which seems to have originated from the desire of removing the foundation of the former. The ancient, and I believe the true, doctrine is, that the

⁶ Art. xxii.

soul never loses its consciousness, but on leaving the body departs immediately according to its character into a state of bliss or misery, neither of which will be complete till at the last day it will be reunited to its companion, and received into heaven or cast down into hell. To those who require for a dogma stronger evidence than that of a parable, it may be observed, that it is implied throughout the Bible, and that the abode of those who have departed in the faith, still known to the Jews by the name of Abraham's bosom, is called *Paradise*, both by our Lord^h, and by St. Paulⁱ, the former distinguishing it from the Grave, the latter from Heaven. The rich man's request for his brethren is natural, and we feel inclined to think with him, that seeing and conversing with a departed friend is the best evidence that could be obtained or desired. We are however assured by Him, *who knew what was in man*, that they who are unconvinced by the Scriptures, would not be persuaded even by an apparition from the dead. This very proof was indeed not long afterwards afforded to many by the resurrection of another Lazarus, and its inefficacy confirms the remark. Such evidence, supposing it not to be rejected as an imposition, might alarm, but it would not change the heart; it would not therefore effect any real reformation. “^k Hence, perhaps, we may learn the reason why this sort of intercourse between the other world and this is so very rare, because it could serve no good end; for God having already given sufficient evidence of all things we are concerned to know, there is no room to expect or hope for such admonitions. He sent the greatest Person of the other world to us, his own Son, and sent him too from the dead; and why he should send a man from the dead to tell what his Son, his apostles and prophets, have already declared, you that can give the reason, give it. Our Saviour's resurrection

^h Luke xxiii. 43.

ⁱ 2 Cor. xii. 4.

^k Sherlock, Discourse 34th, p. 134, and 144.

was something more than merely the apparition of a dead man; he foretold the time and circumstances of his resurrection, and put the proof of his mission and doctrine upon the performance of this great wonder; so that his resurrection became the direct proof, that the doctrine he taught was the doctrine of him who had the power to raise the dead; and his authority after the resurrection was not barely the authority of one coming from the dead, but the authority of him who has power to raise the dead, which authority is greater than that of any man, and therefore proves the divinity of his commission, (and of himself.) And here lies the true difference between the resurrection of Christ, and that of those whom he raised from the dead." Unbelief however, properly so called, is not laid to the charge of this rich man, or his brethren; it was not a future state that they disbelieved, but their own responsibility for the employment of their property; and the rich man does not say of his brethren, that they will believe, but, that *they will repent.*

94. *Jesus declares the power of faith, and that the most perfect obedience is due, and cannot be meritorious.*
Luke xvii. 1—10.

Jesus then warned his disciples, that believers will meet with stumblingblocks, and declared the awful guilt of those who put them before them, by assuring them that it would be better for such to be cast into the lake and drowned. He next commanded forgiveness to a repenting brother, though he may have trespassed against us seven times in a day. The disciples perceived the excellence and the difficulty of the precept, and that faith was the only principle from which it could proceed. They therefore besought him to increase it: and as no created being could either give it or make it grow, they must already have had, at least, an indistinct notion of his Divinity. The connection between

a vigorous faith full of fruits and humility is exemplified in a parable, which teaches that they must obey not some of his commandments, but all. The servant who ploughed, or tended cattle, when he came in from the field was expected to wait at table, nor was he thanked for his attendance; so they, when they had done all that they were ordered, could not claim merit, as if they had conferred a favour; they were still but unprofitable ($\alpha\chiρεῖοι$) servants, that is, they had laid him under no obligation, having done nothing above the service due. Now if the utmost that a man can do is no more than his bounden duty, his reward *must be of grace, not of debt*; and the doctrine, that the supererogatory merit of one may be transferred to another and make up for his deficiencies, is deprived of its foundation.

95. *He reproves the sons of Zebedee, who wished that fire from heaven should destroy the Samaritans.* Luke ix. 51—56.

The nearest and most frequented road to Jerusalem from Galilee, which was through Samaria, occupied three days, and this journey often occasioned disturbances, sometimes even bloodshed. For a journey to Jerusalem, in order to keep the feasts, excited the enmity of the inhabitants; and none could be so offensive to them as that of the Dedication of the Temple. How different had been their reception of Jesus, when at the commencement of his ministry, he had sat down wearied by Jacob's well! He had been not merely entertained with hospitality, but honoured as a Prophet. But then he came from Jerusalem, now he was travelling to it; and by this avowed preference of the Holy City to their mountain, condemned their schism, and in proportion to his reputation excited their resentment. His rebuke of the fiery zeal of the sons of Zebedee, and his leading the disciples forward to another village, without even a remonstrance, is a decisive protest against propagating religion

by force, and suppressing heresy by the secular power. James and John asked, *Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume these Samaritans, even as Elias did?* It was in that very country, that two successive bands of fifty soldiers with their captains, sent by the king to apprehend him, perished through the prayer of that prophet¹. The disciples in their indignation overlooked the difference in the two cases, and as yet did not know that the Gospel breathed a milder spirit than the Law. These Samaritans were highly blameable, but their inhospitality arose from national prejudice, not from personal enmity; nor did they ill-treat Jesus, they only refused to receive him. Above all, the disciples were unconscious that they themselves were influenced more by resentment than by zeal for their Master; nor was their indignation probably quite free from bigotry, though they were disgusted by that vice when exhibited in others. He therefore assured them, that they knew not *what manner of spirit they were of*, for he was come to promote the temporal as well as the spiritual happiness of mankind; *not, as he had repeatedly proved by his miraculous cures, to destroy men's lives, but to save them.* So they went to another village. Unhappily this warning prophetic voice has been little heeded, amid the turbulence of passion. Men, avowing themselves the followers of Jesus, have kindled fires to burn not only Jews and infidels, but even those who have acknowledged the same Saviour, and have designated this cruel gratification of their religious fury, an “act of faith.”

This decisive protest of Jesus, the Divine *Author and Finisher of our faith*, against propagating it by the sword or by the stake, now happily acquiesced in by all Protestants, at least in words, though still too often broken by some of them in spirit, induces me to introduce here a brief outline of the history of persecution, beginning with the Emperor

¹ 2 Kings i. 9—14.

Nero, the first open persecutor. For, though the sin is most inconsistent and most odious in a Christian, it is an extraordinary mistake to suppose with many that Paganism is tolerant. That of Greece and Rome was inseparably interwoven into the State; it was for the legislature to determine what new gods should be worshipped, and with what rites; and it willingly admitted into its Pantheon those of other nations; but it was not in its nature to endure a faith, the professors of which treated its deities as at best non-entities, more often as devils. It is true, that the Historian of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire opens his second chapter with the remark, that “the various modes of worship that prevailed within its limits were considered by the people as equally true, by the philosopher as equally false, and by the magistrate as equally useful.” “And thus,” he continues, “toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord. Such was the mild spirit of antiquity, that the nations were less attentive to the difference than to the resemblance of their religious worship: and the Greek, the Roman, and the Barbarian, as they met before their respective altars, easily persuaded themselves, that under various names, and with various ceremonies, they adored the same deities.” He observes in a note, that “within a century or two, the Gauls themselves applied to their gods the names of Mercury, Mars, &c.” and I may add, that the early Romans had often blended into one the mythology of the Greeks, and of their Tuscan ancestors. This Polytheism exhibited a “republic of gods of opposite tempers and interests, under the control of one parent and monarch;” and to enlarge their number by the importation of foreign deities, or of deceased men, was no extraordinary proof of liberality. The tutelary divinities of captured cities were even formally invited to exchange their abode for Rome; embassies had been deputed more than once to introduce new objects of devotion, and

whatever could incorporate with the system that prevailed among the Greeks and Romans, was welcomed with joy. The worship of many gods is from its nature more tolerant than that of one; yet it exhibits remarkable exceptions, which this author has overlooked, I fear designedly, from a wish of insinuating a disadvantageous contrast of Paganism and Christianity. He indeed acknowledges some obscure traces of intolerance in the Egyptians, as recorded by Juvenal^m; but he forgets, that one of the indictments on which Socrates was condemned to death was hisⁿ disbelief in the gods of his country; and that the worshippers of Bacchus^o had been expelled from Rome under the Republic, on a charge of immorality, similar to that often brought against the early Christians; and that the Jews^p were banished first by the Emperor Tiberius, and afterwards by Claudius. The religion of Rome was indeed essentially political. No new divinity, nor even a festival nor a ceremony, could be introduced without the sanction of the Senate and the consent of the Tribunes; they tolerated none that could not be brought into conformity with the established system, and acted to the last upon the Law of the Twelve Tables: “Let no person have peculiar gods of his own, or worship any new or foreign ones in private, unless they be authorized by

^m Sat. xv.

ⁿ The first charge was, that he did not regard as gods those whom the State so regarded, but introduced other new demons. And it was the very same charge which in a subsequent age caused the Athenians to bring St. Paul before the Areopagus.

^o Livy, xxxix. 16. on this occasion puts these words into the mouth of one of the Consuls; Quoties hoc patrum avorumque ætate negotium est magistratibus datum, ut sacra externa fieri vetarent, sacrificulos vatesque foro, circo, urbe prohiberent, vaticinos libros conquerirent comburerentque, omnem disciplinam sacrificandi, præterquam more Romano, abolerent?

^p Tacitus Ann. ii. 85. Acts of the Apostles xviii. 2. Suetonius, vita Claudii.

public authority." All the Colleges of Priests were subject to a supreme Board, itself dependent upon the government filled up by its own members, and consisting of eight, under a President, the Pontifex Maximus; and there was no distinction, like that of Clergy and Laity, which exists in many false religions as well as in the true; but the Priests also filled civil offices, even the very highest, so that religion was actually merged in the State. If the primitive Christians would have associated with their fellow-citizens at the theatre, or the banquet, if they would have watched with them the gladiators fighting in honour of departed men, and burnt incense to the gods and deceased Emperors, they might have worshipped without restraint (as the pagan Emperor Alexander Severus is said to have done) the Creator and the Redeemer, for then the great principle of intercommunity in religion would have been recognised. But the true God had expressly forbidden Jew and Christian to worship any other Being: and it was their faithful adherence to this commandment that made the heathen hate them as atheists, and persecute them as rebels. Utility, not truth, recommended to the Gentile statesman the national religion. But the spirit of the Mosaic Dispensation was contrary to that of Paganism, for the Israelites *dwelt alone*, and that they might preserve inviolate the worship of Jehovah, they *were not reckoned among the nations who had changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped the creature instead of the Creator*. But Jehovah was more than the God of Israel, he was also their King. With them Church and State were therefore not united, but formed into one body; sins and crimes were equivalent terms, and consequently idolatry became high treason. Christianity, while it adheres as rigidly as Judaism to the sole worship of one God, is from its nature more liberal. Its citizenship, πολιτευμα^q, being in heaven, it keeps itself distinct from the

^q Phil. iii. 20.

State, which it leaves to politicians to mould into monarchy or republic as they please, only infusing into its laws its own spirit, and supporting peace and order by the sanctions of eternal punishments and rewards, requiring no more than liberty, and a sufficient maintenance for its ministers. As God has no longer one peculiar people, no false religion, not even the idolatry which he hates, is to be exterminated by force. Still less, of course, can the corruption of the true faith, however excessive, even if it presumptuously denies the Saviour's divinity, or virtually through a false humility obscures it by the introduction of secondary mediators, justify the committing heretics to the flames, or punishing them by imprisonment, or even by fines. As Christianity spread and attracted notice in the Roman empire, persecution would naturally follow, and the patient endurance of martyrs, who *accepted not deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection*, was mistaken by their persecutors, who could not enter into their feelings, for unreasonable obstinacy. As long as Christians were confounded with Jews, they enjoyed the protection generally granted to the latter, whose exclusive worship though treated with contempt, was yet tolerated, as that not of a sect but of a nation. The Jews however, at once to preserve themselves, and to turn if possible the contempt and hatred from which they suffered upon those who had acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, soon taught the Gentiles to know the distinction. St. Paul and St. Peter were the victims of the first persecution under Nero; and Domitian^s, while he spared St. Jude's grandchildren, the legal representatives it seems of David, because they made no claim to an earthly kingdom, banished St. John to Patmos. Persecution however was by no means peculiarly characteristic of tyrants; Christians were regarded by all who did not join them as enemies of the State; and sovereigns, who in

^s Eusebius iii. 18, 19, 20.

other respects are most deservedly admired, as Trajan and Marcus Aurelius^t, enforced the laws against them. Ten persecutions, greatly differing in severity and in duration, after shorter or longer intervals, are reckoned within a period of about two centuries and a half, till the first Christian Emperor established the faith in his new Rome, which had never been polluted by idolatry.

Constantine had not been long settled on his throne, before he was called upon to determine an essential difference in the Church, and convened at Nicæa the first General Council; which was not content to define the orthodox Faith, but guarded it by anathemas against those who rejected it, a custom which has been adopted by subsequent Councils; and though they have been dropped from the Nicene Creed, they have been retained in that which bears the name of Athanasius. The proceedings were followed up by the banishment of Arius and many who adhered to his doctrine; and banishment led to confiscation of property, and other civil penalties, to be inflicted by the temporal power. Christians soon forgot, that their contests were not to be settled by carnal weapons, and that the Apostle had forewarned them that there *must be heresies*, not that they should extirpate them, but *that they which are approved may be made manifest*. The Christians, when in power, were unwilling to retaliate upon the heathen, and Polytheism, driven from cities into villages, and thence called Paganism, may be said to have died a natural death. It was against those who acknowledged the same Saviour, though they differed in other respects in doctrine

^t The first, it appears from his correspondence with Pliny, enforced the laws against the Christians with reluctance; but the second was an implacable persecutor upon principle, hating Christians, whom he ignorantly condemned (xi. 3.) for their obstinacy; and though admired as a Philosopher, seems in reality to have combined the superstition of the idolater with the self-sufficiency of the Stoic.

and in discipline, that the orthodox chiefly argued, and whom in the end they punished as criminals. Severe laws, depriving heretics of offices of profit and dignity, taking from them the capability of receiving and bequeathing estates, and imposing on them fines, were enacted by succeeding Emperors, and are preserved in the Theodosian cōde. In some few cases they were made liable to death, but this law was usually evaded through the connivance of Emperors, or the intercession of the Church, which at that early period showed an aversion to this unchristian method of suppressing error, through the mouth of its most distinguished professors. Thus Chrysostom^u freely declared, that tares were not to be rooted out. It is a painful fact, that the Doctor of Grace, as he is justly called, to whom the faith is perhaps more deeply indebted than to any other uninspired teacher, was induced to maintain in some of his tracts^x, that the Unity of the Church should be preserved by the temporal power. Nevertheless, Augustine earnestly entreats Marcellinus to extend mercy even to some Donatists, who from their sanguinary excesses against the Catholics, had made themselves as citizens amenable to capital punishment; and numerous passages may be collected from his voluminous writings, which breathe a more Christian spirit. In extenuation of the former, it may be justly urged, that he had written in an instant of irritation, zealously contending for the Faith; in his cooler moments he declares, that no good men are pleased to have any one, although he be an heretic, prosecuted unto death; and^y he tells Petilian the Donatist Bishop, that God had so ordered in his Providence, that though the Emperor had made many Rescripts to admonish and correct them, there

^u Hom. in Matt. 47.

^x Ep. ad Dulcitium; De corruptione Donatist. ad Vincentium.

^y ii. 83.

was no Imperial Law commanding them to be put to death*. Augustine lived to know, that Priscillian, a learned and eloquent Spanish Bishop, with six of his followers, was condemned and executed for tenets of a Manichæan tendency, A.D. 385, at Treves, under the authority of the Emperor Maximus, the first of Christian Princes who shed the blood of his Christian subjects on account of their religious opinions, and he is considered, apparently with reason, the first martyr to religious dissent. On this occasion, both Ambrose, and Martin of Tours, asserted the cause of Toleration. Jovinian, who had opposed the austeries recommended by Priscillian, was himself no less an object of persecution. The Pope and St. Ambrose, inconsistently with his former conduct, pressed for his punishment, and he was exiled for life, by the Emperor Honorius, to a rock off the coast of Illyria.

In the Eastern empire, Leo the Isaurian, of a new family, boldly undertook the reformation of the Church, and began with the destruction of images, which led, as has been observed, to the Pope's renouncing his allegiance. He had to contend with the superstition of the Laity as well as of the Monks, but he persevered till his death, and was imitated by his son, during a very long reign; but after a vigorous opposition of fifty years, the empress Irene, who reigned as the Regent of her child, his minor great grandson, convoked the second Council of Nicaea, (the last that is acknowledged by the Greek Church,) which through the united exertions of the monks and the people, the Pope and the Empress restored the honours of which the images of our Saviour and the Saints had been deprived, but required that they should not rise in relief from the surface, but should be painted. We hear no more of persecution in the East, where believers were soon called upon to suspend their disputes, by the inroads of the successors of Mahomet,

* Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, book xvi. ch. 2.

who severed for ever from the empire its best provinces with unexampled rapidity.

In the West, the Barbarians acquiesced in the short Roman Creed; and ages of bigotted ignorance rolled on, without an attempt to call in question the authority or the theology of the Popes. Arnold of Brescia, an intrepid pupil of the famous scholastic teacher Abelard, had publicly declaimed against the vices of the Clergy, and, being condemned for heresy by the first Lateran Council, had fled from Italy to Switzerland. The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa delivered him up to his arrogant rival, Adrian IV, the only English Pontiff, (memorable for his donation of the lordship of Ireland, which he never in any sense possessed, to our Henry II.) and Arnold was burnt alive at Rome, A.D. 1155, being I believe the first person who underwent capital punishment for his opinions, by order of a Pope. Still, as in the case of the more celebrated Savonarola, three centuries after, the religious and political reformer was so blended in his character, that it is hard to say whether he suffered as a rebel, or a heretic. But no doubt long before, even from the time of Charlemagne, multitudes professing doctrines similar to those of the Reformers, intermixed, it has been said by their enemies, and perhaps in some instances truly, with Manichæism, imported from the East, had existed in the south of France, with the name of Albigenses, and with that of Waldenses in the Alpine valleys of Piedmont. Under the auspices of Innocent III, who completed the scheme of Papal preeminence devised by Gregory the VIIth, the Clergy awoke from their long slumber; and in the fourth Lateran Council, 1215, by far the most numerous hitherto assembled, enacted Canons for the extirpation of heresy, by which persons condemned for this offence were made over to the secular power to receive due punishment, with an hypocritical recommendation of them to mercy. This Pontiff showed, by his suc-

cessive decrees of deposition against two Emperors, and the Kings of France and England, that his comparison of his own power to the sun, and that of lay sovereigns to the moon, was no empty boast. He sent among the Albigenses to convert them St. Dominic, the founder of the mendicant Order of Black Friars, and less honourably distinguished as the first Inquisitor: he proclaimed against them, as if they had been infidels, a Crusade, promised Indulgences and Dispensations to all who would engage in this holy war, and transferred the sceptre of their Sovereign Raymond of Thoulouse to Simon de Montfort. His object was ultimately gained, but not till long after the death of that General and his own, and the massacre of many thousand persons.

In our own country, to pass from communities to individuals, Wycliff, the morning star, as he has been called, of the Reformation, which he preceded as the dawn the sun, had long pronounced his opinions authoritatively at Oxford from the Professor's chair, sustained by the protection of the young king's uncle, John of Gaunt, and a powerful party in the University, which had been exempted from Episcopal jurisdiction, and paid little regard to the bulls of a distant Pope. His enemies at length prevailed to procure his banishment from Oxford; yet he was suffered to close his life unmolested at his parsonage of Lutterworth. After his death, his tenets widely spread: the Clergy were alarmed at their rapid growth among the Gentry, and still more by his writings against their wealth and dignities; and made unsuccessful attempts to obtain from Parliament the power of suppressing heresy by capital punishment. Henry IV. not being the direct heir to his cousin's throne, in his anxiety to strengthen his Parliamentary title by the influence of the Clergy, to whom he chiefly owed his elevation, readily from interest, or, it may be, bigotry, entered into their views, and disgraced the House of Lancaster by consenting to the writ "De Hære-

lico comburendo," the first that stains the English Statute Book on the subject, and decrees this extreme punishment, "to deter others from forming erroneous opinions contrary to the Catholic faith, and the determination of the Church." This Act was enforced within the year upon Sawtre, who had been a popular preacher in a London parish: and as if this had not been enough, another vindictive one against Lollards was passed in the reign of his heroic son, who in this respect trod in his father's steps, and thus incorporated his dynasty with the corruptions of the Papal hierarchy, making one of two alternatives inevitable; either that the improvement of mankind should be cut off, or the sovereignty of his house should cease; a mad and desperate stake, which, exclaims Turner^a in his history, could only have ended in the issue that ensued. The Bolingbrokes disappeared, and the Reformation proceeded. This writ required heretics to be handed over to the secular power, which is "forthwith to do them to be burnt," and even deprived the Crown of the privilege of pardoning. It continued to disgrace the Statute Book long after the Reformation; and we have instances of its being put into execution upon two Anabaptists under Queen Elizabeth, and two Arians under James I. The Act after this fell into disuse, but it was not actually repealed till the 29th of Charles II. a reign equally distinguished by a corrupt and disgraceful administration, and by excellent laws, which, in the words of Judge Blackstone^b, "delivered our land from the slavery of military tenures, our bodies from arbitrary imprisonment by the Habeas Corpus Act, and our minds from the tyranny of ecclesiastical bigotry, by demolishing this last badge of superstition in the English law." When we reproach Rome with the fires of Smithfield and Oxford, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the revoca-

^a Turner's Middle Ages of England, vol. 2. book ii.

^b Vol. iv. on Public Wrongs.

tion of the Edict of Nantes, which expelled two hundred^c thousand members of the Reformed Church from France, and dispersed and persecuted their congregations, we are reminded, that the importunity of Cranmer extorted from the reluctant Edward his signature to the warrant for burning Joan of Kent for some misconception of our Lord's human nature, and that Calvin instigated the magistrates of Geneva to execute Servetus. We must allow that few Protestant communities who have had the power, have always been able to resist the temptation, and our own cannot plead not guilty to the charge; for not one reign can be named from the Reformation to that of James, in which persons have not been burned for their religion. Even the Non-conformists, who fled from the tyranny of the Court of High Commission, and settled on the bleak and barren shores of New England, to enjoy liberty of worship, according to their conscience, denied to them at home, themselves refused it to others. So far indeed were they from granting this boon, that they conferred upon the civil Magistrate the coercive authority, which they had protested against in Prelates, and enacted and occasionally enforced the penalty of death against those whom they pronounced to be heretics. Of all these cases, that of Servetus is the most notorious, and has excited the greatest indignation; nor would I wish, out of respect to the memory of his eminent opponent, "incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy," to use the words of the judicious Hooker, to extenuate a crime. But candour requires the acknowledgement, that Servetus had fled from France, on account not of anti-Roman, but anti-Trinitarian opinions, which would have been punished at Paris, no less than at Geneva. Calvin, it is to be lamented, caused him to be tried; but he also solicited, though in vain, that he should not undergo so terrible a death as burning; and while modern historians

^c The estimate of Anquetil, *Histoire de France*.

throw upon him all the blame, the act was approved throughout the Reformed Churches; I believe I may say, by all his contemporaries, with the honourable exception of Bullinger. Happily in our own country, such cases are rare; and it should ever be borne in mind, that under Elizabeth, who was declared by the Pope to be an Usurper, the Missionary Priests suffered not so much on account of their faith, as for treason real or presumed; for other Roman Catholics were not molested. During the reign of her father, which exhibited at times the revolting spectacle of martyrs of both Churches perishing in the same flames, the one for denying his supremacy, the other for maintaining his own creed, the Reformation was only commenced. Henry, in fact, as his will proves, died a Roman Catholic, though not a Papist, his opposition being not to Roman doctrines, but to Roman authority. And not to speak of the Lollards of preceding reigns, what are the very few victims of bigotry under Edward, and Elizabeth, and James, to the four years of the Marian persecution, in which nearly three hundred persons were burnt for their religion, not in a paroxysm of passion, but deliberately and successively throughout England! As soon as danger seemed to menace the Roman Church, it showed itself in its true light. As Gibbon remarks^d, “it defended by violence the empire, which it had acquired by fraud: and a system of peace and benevolence was soon disgraced by proscriptions, wars, massacres, and the institution of the Holy Office.” In the Netherlands alone, more than one hundred thousand of the subjects of Charles V. are said to have suffered by the hands of the executioners: and this extraordinary number is attested by Grotius^e, “a man of genius and learning, who preserved his moderation amidst the fury of contending sects, and who composed the Annals

^d Decline and Fall, chap. 16.

^e Annal. de Rebus Belgicis, l. i. p. 12.

of his own age and country, at a time when the invention of printing had facilitated the means of intelligence, and increased the danger of detection.” Even allowing much exaggeration, we may at least suppose the number made out, if we included the Viceroyalty of the Duke of Alva, under his son. We are so constituted, that we are more affected by the carnage of one well-contested battle field, than by the obscure deaths throughout the campaign; and thus St. Bartholomew’s day shocks us more than the 31,000 victims^f, that have been immolated in Spain, year after year, during three centuries, by “the Holy Office.” That tremendous Court, better known to us under the title of the Inquisition, professed, says Bp. Marsh, the unerring judgment which belongs to God alone, while it discards his attribute of mercy: and with stern impartiality, arrested men and women, ignorant and learned, high and low, and shrunk not from trying Ministers of State, and Ecclesiastics of acknowledged piety and learning, and even of episcopal rank. No genuine Christian could endure even an open and fair trial of a heretic, of the worst description, if his condemnation were to be followed by committing him alive to the flames; but words are not strong enough to reprobate adequately a secret tribunal, which never confronted the accusers with the accused, and bringing no specific charge, required the latter to discover and declare his offence, and so to convict himself. This artful scheme for detecting and punishing heresy, comprehended of late years within its limits, Freemasonry, and even Jansenism; and having been introduced into Spain for the punishing of relapsed Jewish converts, early took cognizance of Jews who had never abjured their faith, and of Mahometans. Though it grew out of the persecution of the Albigenses in the south of France, by the Pontiff to whom our King John did homage,

^f The estimate in the History of the Inquisition by Llorente, who had been its Secretary, and had access to its Archives.

it never found its way into our country; nor has it prospered in France. In Italy it has been comparatively harmless; but in Spain it took root, and when reorganised under an Inquisitor General, by Ferdinand of Arragon, with the reluctant consent of his consort Isabella of Castile, it flourished, till reduced to insignificance by the humanity of modern times. Its Acts of Faith have been performed on a grand scale, and often in the presence of Sovereigns, and for their gratification; yet these perhaps ought to excite less horror, than the misery it has silently and secretly caused to so many families.

When reproached in our turn with acting in the same manner, our answer to Rome is, that our Church has long renounced the right and duty of persecution, which with them is the rule, with us has been the exception; and if at the commencement of our Reformation they can bring a few instances in favour of it, it may fairly be replied, that our Prelates had been in that respect contaminated by the system under which they were educated, and that it is contrary to the genius of Protestantism. Even in the first year of Elizabeth, a better spirit began to appear, for an Act of the Legislature restricted the burning of heretics to a Provincial Synod; and a boundary was for the first time fixed to heresy, for no tenets were to be condemned as heretical, except those that are contradictory to the Scriptures, or to the first four General Councils, or which should be hereafter censured by Parliament, with the assent of the Clergy. In the Articles, which are remarkably liberal on the subject of ecclesiastical government, it is determined, that “the Church has authority in controversies of Faith, provided it ordains not any thing contrary to God’s word written;” but it carries this authority no further than is done by these sects that have seceded from it, in fact, no further than is necessary for its own preservation: Its language, says Bishop Marsh^s,

^s Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome.

is this ; “ Persuaded ourselves that our religion is true, we gladly receive all who are willing to partake in our faith and worship. But as our welfare depends on the observance of our rules, we expect such observance from our members in general, and from our authorized ministers in particular. Still if any of its members should think on examination that the creed which he had received was erroneous, we should say, if continuance in our communion would be a restraint on the exercise of your private judgment, you are at liberty to exchange our society for one more congenial with your own opinions. We shall neither throw impediments in the way of your departure, nor follow you as an apostate with pains and penalties, when you have departed from our communion.” But Rome cannot give up her right to enforce obedience from all baptized persons, as long as she maintains her theory, that she is the mistress as well as the mother of all Churches. Allegiance to the Church is accordingly considered by her in the same light as allegiance to the State, and in the official Roman Catechism of the canonised Pius V. heretics and schismatics, though no longer members of the Church, are still reckoned amenable to its power as persons to be punished, and are doomed by anathema to damnation ; a doctrine now actually taught in the College of Maynooth. Nor is this exertion of authority confined to individual acts of secession ; it embraces Societies, and applies no less to us, whose ancestors withdrew from the Church of Rome, than to them, and to our Queen as much as to us. The principle ratified at Trent had been clearly laid down long before by Boniface VIII. in a celebrated Bull. Starting from the position that the Church is one, and therefore can only have one head, he finds that one in St. Peter’s successors. He then refers to his two swords, one of which he calls spiritual, the other material ; the first to be used by the Church, the other for it ; and as one must of necessity be inferior, it is an easy inference,

that the King's sword must yield to that of the Priest. The whole doctrine is summed up in this sentence, " Wherefore we declare, that it is absolutely essential to the salvation of every human being, that he be subject unto the Roman Pontiff." Liberal Roman Catholics, shocked at such positions, would fain persuade us, as we have no doubt that, in this country at least, they have persuaded themselves, that this arrogant claim, though it has never been formally retracted, is obsolete ; but later Bulls, (as that called *In Coena Domini*, which excommunicates and anathematises all who do not acknowledge the jurisdiction of the See of Rome, which is still read out in Passion week, before the Pope,) breathe the same spirit; nor can it be excused as the act only of the Head of their Church. Their General Councils hold the same language ; and not only hold it, but when opportunity offered, fixed their meaning by their conduct; for John Huss (A.D. 1415.) and Jerome of Prague (A. D. 1416.) were the victims of that of Constance, not of John XXIII. who disclaimed all share in the proceedings, and was himself soon after degraded by that assembly, which declared its superiority to the Pope, and proved it by deposing the three who disputed the title, and electing a new one. It had met to reform the Church ; it was constituted on a more democratic plan than any former one, and being far more numerous, and divided into five nations, we may fairly say, that it represented the learning, wisdom, and piety of the age. Yet its conduct only showed, that it was as hopeless to expect the object for which it met from these divines, as from the Pope. They decreed, that General Councils should meet at fixed periods ; but we have no reason to regret the failure of their scheme, for they revived no forgotten Gospel truth, they only endeavoured to transfer spiritual domination from the Bishop of Rome to themselves ; and their sessions lasted long enough to show, that a body will venture upon bolder acts of iniquity than one individual, being screened

by their numbers from reproach. To the guilt of murder, they added that of perfidy. Huss had appeared under the protection of a safe conduct from the Emperor; and the Council justified the violation of it, to which Sigismond assented, by the assertion, that neither faith nor promise, by natural, divine, or human law, was to be observed, to the prejudice of the Catholic Religion; a principle which had been already announced by Urban VIII. A.D. 1378, and is founded on the Decretals. Thus the Council demonstrated, that Persecution is a principle as much ecclesiastical as papal.

As recently as A.D. 1781, a Nun was the last victim of the Spanish Inquisition, and we may hope that never more may real heretics undergo the punishment of death; yet in most Christian countries, Dissenters from the national Church are deprived more or less of the privileges of citizens, and many retain what may be called the negative persecution, of not allowing their public worship. Complete toleration is comparatively recent in any; and it is mortifying to know, that in Holland, where it was first sanctioned by the State, it originated not in principle, but in commercial policy. It is painful to think how slowly the professors of a religion, which so preeminently inculcates peace and good will among men, have learnt what may be considered an elementary lesson. Even the wise and enlightened Bacon, who, both in philosophy and politics, was so far before his age, thought that uniformity in religion was indispensable to the support of government, and that no toleration could safely be given to Sectaries. Milton, himself a Sectarian, went further, refusing it to all who denied the sufficiency of Scripture; and it was during the civil wars, when the Protestants were divided into Churchmen, Presbyterians, and Independents, that toleration was first advocated by two eminent divines, whose works still edify and delight the Christian, the Independent Owen, and

the Episcopalian Taylor. Even Locke, the friend of civil and religious liberty, and the author of Letters in favour of toleration, considers that Roman Catholics are justly excepted from it, on account of their allegiance in spiritual concerns to a foreign Bishop. The Act of Toleration, which so honourably distinguishes the reign of William III. and was at the time condemned by many, would not now be regarded as a liberal measure, for Dissent though thereby legalized, was subjected to many restrictions. It was limited to persons professing a belief in the Trinity, and required that dissenting ministers and schoolmasters, though they received no remuneration from the State, should sign all the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England. Now in our own country, all who profess any form of Christianity, enjoy the same political rights as the members of the Established Church, and all offices, with a very limited exception, are open to all. The only danger is, that of running into the opposite extreme, and of encouraging and remunerating what ought only to be allowed; and that from excess of mistaken liberality, the State will hurt the feelings of the majority, by gratifying the minority; which it must do if it endow in any degree a Church, which the nation has denounced for centuries as *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*

96. *He cleaneth at their own petition ten Lepers, of whom the only grateful one was a Samaritan. Luke xvii. 11—19.*

As if it were to show that the bigotry of the Samaritans was not universal, the inhospitality of these villagers is contrasted with the gratitude of an individual of that nation, who was one of a company of ten lepers. In obedience to the Law, which declared them to be unclean, they stood at a distance, and cried out, *Jesus, Master, have mercy on us.* All had cried out; but the Samaritan alone, when cured, both *glorified God*, and fell down at the feet of Jesus, *giving him thanks.* Jesus

in return said unto him, *Arise, thy faith hath saved thee.* All had been cleansed, as they went to show themselves, as he ordered them, to the priests: all then must have had faith in his miraculous power; but the Samaritan alone believed in him as a Saviour, and alone received a spiritual blessing. This appears to be the explanation of an apparent contradiction. Salvation in Scripture is an ambiguous word, signifying deliverance; and the context only can show whether it refers to the body or to the soul, to this world or to the next. *He was saved*, or, as it is sometimes rendered, *was made whole*, is in the New Testament equivalent to, he was cured. When blind Bartimæus adjured Jesus as the *Son of David*, and he answered, *Receive thy sight, thy faith hath saved thee*; the restoration of that faculty is the salvation intended. It is no less plain, that when Jesus said of Zacchæus, *This day is salvation come to this house*, he spoke of salvation from sin. In Peter's vindication of the miracle wrought upon the lame man, the two ideas are united: *Be it known, that by the name of Jesus Christ doth this man stand before you whole.* And then, rising from this inferior to the higher import of the word, he continues, *Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.* The apostles, the rulers, and the audience, had the full use of their limbs, but they all needed spiritual salvation; and St. Peter wished to persuade them from the proof they had just had of the power of Jesus over the body, that he was also a Saviour from sin, and from the wrath to come. We conclude then that this Samaritan was saved not only from leprosy, but also from that moral malady, of which it is a significant type, which renders a man as unfit for communion with his Creator, as does a loathsome disease for intercourse with his fellow creatures. Our first feeling on reading this history is indignation at the ingratitude of the nine; let us, however, take care that

they do not rise up in judgment against us. Deficient as they were in the gratitude, which the Lord who seeth the heart requires, they did more than those in our days, who on recovering from some dangerous disorder, merely desire the minister to offer up thanks for them in the congregation; and there are, it is to be feared, many who do not make even this acknowledgment. The priest was not to certify the cure of a leper, till he had made atonement for him before the Lord; and this formal service, consisting of purification and sacrifices, required eight days, and would subject him to some expense. It is evident that our Lord required something more from these than the Law, that is, such a testimony of gratitude as had been offered by this alien; a claim which proves at least the Divinity of his mission. The ingratitude of the nine excites his surprise and regret. His language implies that they were Jews, and misery in this instance seems to have united them with one with whom under other circumstances they would have had no friendly intercourse.

While Jews and Samaritans had no friendly dealings with one another, the divine Saviour of all men gave evidence of his good will towards both; and when we consider that his human nature was perfect, it does not surprise us that he did not act like any other Jew, but was free from all the prejudices of his age and country. These descendants of Assyrian idolaters, as far as we can judge, were better prepared for his reception than the children of Israel; and it is remarkable, that while the latter are dispersed over all the world, the small remnant of the former, from their settlement in the land, have continued under the mountain where their fathers worshipped. Their colonies in Egypt and Syria are extinct, and their small community now confined to the valley of Naplous. While the Jews have adopted the alphabet of their conquerors, they retain the original Hebrew one, in which they had received the

Pentateuch; yet, like the Jews, they explain away the prophecy of Shiloh, though they expect such a Teacher as Moses, whom God shall raise up unto them like unto his brethren. Dr. Wilson, who visited them in 1843, was hospitably entertained by their high priest, who through Manasseh, who established their worship on Mount Gerizim, traces his succession from Aaron; and he had demonstration of the strong antipathy which still keeps these followers of Moses apart, for the Jewish Rabbi spoke of them as the despicable Samaritans; and when he and his friends came to return the call of the traveller, the Samaritan high priest called out, Who told these brutes to come hither?

97. Jesus answers the question, when the kingdom of God shall come. Luke xvii. 20—37.

The Pharisees enquiring when this reign of heaven, which Jesus had so often announced, would commence, he answered, that it would not be ushered in, as they conceived, with any outward display, for though unobserved, it had already come upon them before they were aware. He who was amongst them, was this expected Sovereign, but this was a fact overlooked by them, and he intimated that they would hereafter wish in vain for the opportunities which they had neglected; they would *desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man.* He then warned his disciples not to be deluded, as the nation would be, by false Messiahs, for he would return after his sufferings and rejection, with the rapidity of lightning, and with the unexpectedness of the flood, and of the overthrow of Sodom; and as Noah and Lot were preserved in these general judgments, so he would interpose to separate his faithful followers from their ungodly companions. When asked the precise period of this visitation, he intimated by a proverb, that, as wherever a dead carcase lies, birds of prey will assemble to devour it; so, when the measure of a nation's iniquity is full,

Divine justice will reach it. They might therefore look for the destruction of Jerusalem in their own days, for this saying, and the observation that one labourer in the fields *would be taken and another left*, repeated as it is when the same calamity was again announced to take place within that generation, fix this prediction to a temporal judgment.

90. *The parables of the Unjust Judge, and of the Pharisee and Publican.* Luke xviii. 1—14.

Jesus next held forth strong encouragement to frequent earnest prayer by a parable; and as he did not hesitate to propose for imitation the prudence of a dishonest steward, so he now compared the righteous Governor of the world with a judge, who, though influenced neither by fear of God nor regard for man, was prevailed on to do right by an importunity that annoyed him; thus drawing moral lessons from the vices, as well as from the virtues of men. Some injudicious commentators extenuate the judge's faults, but the argument is convincing in proportion to his unworthiness; for if even he, after a season, could be wearied and teased^h into doing justice to a widow, who was indifferent to him, will One, who is perfect in benevolence as well as justice, fail to answer the incessant cry of his own elect, whom he loves? He not only puts it as a question which admits of but one answer, but affirms it in the strongest manner. At the same time he intimated, that he too, like the unjust judge, may leave his supplicants a long time under trouble and discouragements, but he does it only to try and to strengthen their faithfulness, and will grant their petition at the fittest season. The petition, we should

^h ‘Υπωπτιάζειν means literally *to strike under the eye*; hence metaphorically, *to mortify*, (1 Cor. ix. 27.) and here *to stun or weary by continual importunity*.

remember, is not for what they may wish, but for the redress of wrong; and the context leads us to refer it to the deliverance in the day of the revelation of the Son of Man which he had just before so awfully announced. His alarming enquiry, *Nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?* seems to be a warning that the trial will be so severe, that, as he told them afterwards, *the love of many will wax cold*, and the very deliverance for which they prayed, when it arrived, would find few to welcome it. There appears then to be an especial reference to his coming in judgment to destroy Jerusalem, but his question will also apply to his second Advent, which is to be preceded by an almost universal apostasy; and the reasoning shows, that the believers of all ages as well as of that, may take the encouragement of the parable, as the character of the Judge of all the earth is unchangeable. The parable of the unkind indolent neighbour, who was overcome by his friend's importunity, had recommended intercessions for others, and this as powerfully enforces prayer for ourselves. The prayer, however, that will be heard must not only be incessant, but of a proper kind, and must be offered in a right, that is an humble, spirit: and this he teaches in the most impressive manner, by contrasting in another parable two worshippers, a Pharisee and a Publican, the representatives of two classes to be found in every age; the self-righteous, who, because they are not guilty of adultery, extortion, fraud, or other such heinous transgressions, are not only proud of their own virtue, that is, penitent sinners, who only plead for pardon, whom the former despise. The address of the Pharisee cannot be correctly called prayer, for it contains neither deprecation of punishment nor supplication for benefits. It consists entirely of thanksgiving, and that for his own merits, which he complacently enumerates; nor can he be content to commend himself, without condemning his fellow worshipper, whom he assumes to be unworthy.

The prayer of the Publican, short as it is, contains both an acknowledgment of unworthiness, and a petition for pardon; and the word in which he begs for mercy, *ἰλασθητί*, seems to express his hope of obtaining it through a propitiatory sacrifice. Both leave the temple in the frame in which they entered it. The result of their worship, which themselves and the hearers could only conjecture, Jesus who knew it declared; and pronounced the admired Pharisee to be condemned, the despised Publican to be justified or accepted; thus teaching, that *God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace unto the humble*. The two are graphically sketched, as in a drawing, and from their air and manner we may anticipate their behaviour; the former stands by himself, realizing the Prophet's description, and seeming to say, *Stand aside, I am holier than thou*: the latter humbly keeps at a distance, presumes not to look up, and strikes upon his breast.

99. *Jesus is entertained at Bethany in the house of Martha.*
Luke x. 38—42.

Our great Example has shown us by his conduct, that friendship is compatible with perfect philanthropy, for he is said to have loved John above his other disciples; and at Bethany lived a family to which he was particularly attached, Lazarus, and his sisters Martha and Mary. Jesus now visited them on his way to Jerusalem, and having entered as usual upon some edifying discourse, Mary, delighted with the opportunity, sat down at his feet, as was the custom of disciples, to profit from his instructions; but Martha, like many engaged in the business of active life, was so immoderately anxious to provide a suitable entertainment for so illustrious a guest, that she would have had every other occupation give way to hers, and was displeased with her sister for not coming to help her. She appealed to Jesus himself, and expostulated with him upon the supposed impropriety of her sister's conduct; but our perfect Teacher

viewed it in a different light, and addressing Martha with a tender repetition of her name, observed that she was disquieted about many things less worthy of her anxiety; and that, while she was busy in providing a needless plenty of the food that perisheth, her sister had chosen the better part, by seizing on the opportunity afforded of spiritual improvement, the effect of which was permanent, and would not be taken away. Though Martha was on this occasion faulty, yet she was a true believer, and her complaint arose, in part at least, out of regard to Jesus. We may therefore suppose that this affectionate reproof had its proper effect. Jesus could not be displeased with her desire of showing him all the respect in her power; but Mary's listening to his teaching was more acceptable to one, whose meat and drink was to do the will of his heavenly Father.

100, 101. *He attends the feast of the Dedication; but declaring himself and the Father to be one, the Jews attempt to stone him for blasphemy, and he is obliged to retire beyond Jordan. John x. 22—42.*

After a two months' absence, Jesus, notwithstanding the danger he had experienced on his last visit, returned to Jerusalem for the feast of the Dedication of the Temple; which we learn from Josephus, was celebrated in his time with much solemnityⁱ, and is still kept, notwithstanding its destruction. We may infer from our Lord's attending it, that he does not disapprove of the institution of religious memorials of special national mercies.

This feast commenced on the fifth of December, and lasted eight days. It being winter, and the weather perhaps stormy^k, Jesus was walking in the colonnade on the east

ⁱ Ant. xii. 7.

^k Χειμῶν, meaning both storm and winter, is probably here used for the former.

side; the usual place of resort for Jewish worshippers, called after Solomon, but no part of the original building, though the substructure of it of immense stones, so much admired by Josephus, might have been raised by that sovereign. The rulers came to him here, and asked how long he meant to keep them in a painful state of suspense, by speaking of himself as the *Light of the world*, the *Door of the sheep*, and the *Good Shepherd*, without plainly avowing, without a figure, that he was the Messiah. To this interrogation he answered, that he had told them, (at least in effect,) but that if he had not, his miracles were a sufficient declaration. But because they were not of his flock, they would not believe, whereas his sheep would hear his voice, and follow him; they would never perish of their own accord, nor would any enemy be able to force them away; for his Father, whose power was irresistible, had given them to him, and he was *one* with God. *One* we must understand not in person but in being, and consequently both in will and power¹. His conclusion, that being *one* with the omnipotent Father, he was able to defend his sheep against all enemies, sufficiently proves that he meant to claim divine power, and the Jews deemed the claim blasphemy, as it would have been, had he been a mere man; and their preparing to stone him, as on a former occasion, is the best exposition of his words. Our Lord, in his intercession for us, prayed that all his disciples might be one, as he and the Father are; but there the context shows, since they are men and his Father God, that he must be speaking of unity of will and disposition, while here it is as plain that the attribute referred to is power. They expressly declared, that they would stone him, because he made himself God. Our Lord did not deny the charge, yet, not judging it proper at that time to bring that mysterious truth into dis-

¹ He uses the neuter not the masculine, [*εν*, not *εισ*,] one, therefore, in person, but in substance, that is, in Deity.

cussion, lest he should farther irritate them, he showed that in a subordinate sense their Law called men gods^m, meaning their priests and magistrates, who were types of the Deity; and therefore they had no right to object to the title of Son of God being claimed by one whom the Father had consecrated in a higher degree, and for a higher purpose. He added, that they might have had reason for refusing credit to his words, if he did not do the works of his Father; but if he gave that evidence of almighty power, though they disregarded his testimony, they ought not to despise but to acknowledge his credentials, that they might know that the Father was in him, and he in the Father. The context must decide the nature of this union. He had just said as Messiah, *The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me.* Therefore, in justifying himself by the Scripture in taking the name of God, he only meant to refute the charge of blasphemy, not to deny that it belonged to him also in the higher sense. And that they so understood him appears from their not being satisfied with his explanation, and his being obliged to withdraw from their violence.

The discourse was abruptly closed by their endeavour to seize him; and the mildness and meekness of our Lord's replies, even while they were seeking his death, are the more worthy to fix our attention, as we often see the most exemplary of his followers exasperated by malicious opposition, very far short of that to which he was continually exposed, and which he always endured with perfect patience. He then retired to Bethabara, where John had originally baptized; and his ministry there of some months, in a part of the country in which he had not taught before, was attended with great success; many of the people, who remembered John's testimony to him, believing on him in consequence.

^m As in Psalm lxxxii. 1. 6.

102. *He restores Lazarus to life.* John xi. 1—47.

Jesus was recalled into the vicinity of Jerusalem by Martha and Mary, who entreated him, by his affection for their brother, who was dangerously ill, to come and cure him. Contrary however to their hopes, on hearing of his sickness, he remained two days where he was, to allow time for his death. His delay would excite anxiety, and perhaps hard thoughts of him in this family which was dear to him, and for a season it greatly augmented their distress; but if they and his disciples had attended to his answer, they would have been prepared for the result, for he declared that *the sickness was not unto death*, and afterwards that *he would awake him out of sleep*. The event showed the fitness of his proceeding, for the ensuing miracle redounded far more to his glory and their benefit, than an immediate compliance with their request. His delay must also have given pain to himself, for on witnessing the weeping of the sisters and their friends, he also shed tears. On this occasion, and when meditating on the impending ruin of his country, he is recorded to have given way to his feelings; thus proving, contrary to the theory of some moral philosophers, that both friendship and patriotism are compatible with perfect virtue. He now not only shed tears, but groaned twice. According to some, from the misery which sin had brought into the world; according to others, at the unbelief shown even at this advanced period of his ministry. We may adopt both opinions, supposing that it was both for sin, and for their incredulity; for when he ordered the stone to be removed from the tomb, even Martha's faith and hope seem to have again died away. On the third day he intimated his purpose of returning; and this surprised his disciples, who doubted whether he would be able to protect himself and them from the rage of his enemies. He answered, in figurative lan-

guage, implying, that as men labour and travel securely while the sun affords light, but are liable to stumble in the dark; so he was safe, and ought to walk in his vocation during his allotted period. The Twelve accompanied him, agreeing in sentiment with Thomas, who declared his intention to die with him rather than desert him. Jesus did not arrive till the fourth day after the death of his friend. As Bethany was scarcely two miles from Jerusalem, many of the inhabitants came to condole with the sisters; and this circumstance was overruled to make the miracle more extensively known, and more fully attested. Martha, on hearing of the arrival of Jesus, left the company to meet and welcome him at some distance; and expressed her confidence, that he both could and would have cured her brother had he been on the spot. She seems to have had still a faint hope of his restoration to life; but she addressed Jesus only as a Prophet, who wrought miracles by faith and prayer, not as the incarnate God, who commanded by his own omnipotence. He assured her that Lazarus should rise again, and she declared her belief in the general Resurrection. To enlarge her expectations, and to bring her to a right conception of his character, he informed her that he was the Author of the Resurrection and of Life; and such was the constraining influence of his speech, that she acknowledged him as the Messiah. She immediately went to call her sister, evidently having now a strong expectation excited, that he who had announced himself as the Author of life, would restore it to her brother. Mary accompanied her, and addressed him in the same words as her sister: and her friends, following, presuming she was gone to weep at the grave, formed, accidentally as it were, a numerous party to witness this most convincing of miracles. It was too evident to be denied, and our Lord was desirous that they should draw from it the proper conclusion, that he was sent from God. For this reason he first prayed, and his prayer is

thanksgiving to his Father, for hearing him always, anticipating, as if already wrought, the miracle which he then performed, by calling Lazarus out of the tomb; who at the call came forth alive, after he had been dead four days. Many of the spectators believed in him, for that was the conclusion that Jesus wished them to draw; for the fact of Lazarus's resurrection none could deny. Others, who were governed by an implacable enmity, immediately reported the event to the rulers, who (such was their infatuation and wickedness) summoned a council to consider how they might most easily destroy him, at the very time that they confessed that he had wrought not only this, but many miracles. This last in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, which restored to life a person apparently of some wealth and consequence, seemed likely to cause the people to rise in his favour, and fixed their determination. This we learn from St. John, who alone records it, and so affords an explanation of their conduct.

There is a tradition, that Lazarus was then a young man, and that he survived our Lord thirty yearsⁿ; and we may presume that the earlier Evangelist omitted any mention of him, lest they might expose him to danger, upon the same principle as when they record the cutting off of Malchus's ear, they take care not to name Peter. Jesus retired in consequence to Ephraim, but continued his usual occupation of teaching and working miraculous cures.

103. *Jesus answers the question of the Pharisees concerning Divorce. Matt. xix. 3—12. Mark x. 1—12.*

The popularity of Jesus was too great for his enemies to apprehend him, and they must have felt, that if they had had the courage to venture upon such a proceeding, they were unable to substantiate against him a criminal charge. Their only hope then was to entrap him, by drawing him into

ⁿ Recorded by Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 65. §. 54.

some discussion of the Law, which might afford ground for accusation, and for this purpose the Pharisees asked his opinion respecting divorce. The Rabbis were divided upon this question, so he could not decide in favour of either party without giving offence to the other. The school of Thammai had determined that a wife ought not to be divorced, except for some gross misconduct, or some bodily defect unknown previous to marriage; while that of Hillel, who had only recently died, maintained that the will of the husband was a sufficient cause; and this determination was of course popular. Long before, the author of the Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus had said, *If a wife go not as thou wouldest have her, cut her off from thy flesh, give her a bill of divorce, and let her go^o*; and Josephus tells us, that he put away his, after she had borne him three children, because he was not pleased with her manners^p. Our Saviour, as before, declared adultery, which breaks this sacred contract, to be the only justifiable cause, and proved his decision to be correct, by referring to the institution of Marriage, appointed by God in Paradise before the entrance of sin. *In the beginning, God created a male and a female.* Now if a plurality or a succession of wives, at the discretion of the husband, in other words, if either polygamy or divorce, except for adultery, were to be allowed, God, instead of pronouncing this one man and one woman to be one flesh, would have made several wives for Adam. The words in Genesis are supposed by some to be those of Adam, by others those of Moses, because our progenitor could know nothing of the relation of parents and children; they are here said to be those of God, and whether spoken by himself, or as inspiring either of them to speak, they equally convey a divine command. To this our Saviour added the proper corollary, *What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.* They then asked why Moses had commanded

^o Ecclus. xxv. 26.

^p Ant. iv. 8.

divorce. To this Jesus replied, that he had only *permitted* it; that is, they were suffered without punishment by the magistrate to put away their wives, because they might otherwise from their hardness of heart have ill treated them, but that it was a departure from the original institution, which ought not to be tolerated. Both sexes are put by our Lord upon a level, as it is declared to be as much adultery for the husband to take another wife as for the wife to take another husband. The disciples, who had not risen above the prejudices of their countrymen, supposed, that if marriage was indissoluble except for this one cause, it would be better not to marry. It follows, that in a case in which divorce is lawful, it is also lawful to marry again; but the Church of Rome, having exalted marriage into a Sacrament, has rendered it perpetual; and as our Reformation never extended to Ecclesiastical law, divorce in England even now can only be obtained by authority of Parliament. Celibacy is regarded by that Church as a council of perfection for the laity, and is required by her from the clergy; there is however nothing in Scripture to disparage matrimony, which was even enjoined to the Jewish priests, and is declared in the epistle to the Hebrews *to be honourable in all^a*. Those to Timothy and Titus assume, that Christian Ministers will in general have wives; and in the first to the Corinthians, which is the stronghold of the advocates of celibacy, St. Paul only gives it as his opinion, that *it is good for the present distress*. Even here he adds, *but if thou marry thou hast not sinned*; and both his conclusion and our Lord's reply show, that contingency is a gift granted only to some, and that none but those can innocently choose a single life.^r.

^a Heb. xiii. 4.

^r Heb. xiii. 4. 1 Cor. vii. 26.

104. *Jesus blesses children.* Matt. xix. 13, 14. Mark x.
13—16. Luke xviii. 15—17.

Children were now brought by their parents to Jesus, to bless them. Luke calls them *βρέφη, infants;* and we learn from Mark, that they were young enough to be taken up in his arms. As they needed no bodily cure, and were too young to learn, they must have been brought to receive a spiritual blessing. Imposition of hands was used by the Jews in the invocation of the Holy Spirit, by such as stood in any superior relation to others, or were esteemed of peculiar sanctity, and these parents must have regarded Jesus at least as a prophet. The passage is introduced into our Service for Infant Baptism, and seems to sanction as strongly as any inference can, the custom which has prevailed from the beginning, of admitting the children of believers into the Church. Indeed a positive command was not necessary; for as they had been taken into covenant with God by the rite of Circumcision under the Mosaic as under the patriarchal dispensation; the Apostles, as Jews, would, as a matter of course, have administered to them Baptism, unless they had been expressly forbidden. On this occasion they rebuked the parents; but their Master reprobated them, and again recommended children as examples of the qualities he required in his followers, teaching by a living parable, as it were, Innocence and Humility.

105. *Jesus answers a rich young man, who enquires what he is to do to inherit eternal life, and takes occasion to warn his disciples against covetousness. The Parable of the Labourers hired at different hours.* Matt. xix. 16—30. xx. 1—16. Mark x. 17—31. Luke xviii. 18—30.

A young ruler, who was *exceedingly rich,* now came running to Jesus, and kneeling down, enquired what good thing he must do in order to procure eternal life. Jesus

answered him as he had done the lawyer, by referring him to the moral Law, *If thou art willing to enter into life, keep the commandments.* But they were men of different characters; the lawyer spoke to ensnare him, or at best to gain his commendation; the ruler honestly sought instruction, and though he preferred the pleasures of life to the self-denying service of Christ, and went away, it was sorrowfully, and with a heart divided between heavenly and earthly treasure. Jesus, it is added, *loved him.* His inclination therefore must have been good, but he had not resolution to act upon the conviction of his judgment. We hear no more of him: yet the conversation could not fail to humble him; and it is possible that he might hereafter submit to the test of his sincerity required, and make the sacrifice of his very great possessions. Our Saviour, in order to show him how low an estimate he had formed of morality, first objected to his giving him, whom he conceived to be no more than a man, the title of "good," as all men are naturally evil, and, speaking correctly, it can only be affirmed of God. The young man ignorantly enquired, according to the popular notion of the casuists of his day, who taught that they might select one of God's commandments, which of them he was to keep; whereas the perfect fulfilment of all is the indispensable condition, if salvation is not to be bestowed as a gift, but claimed as the recompense of works. Our Saviour, passing over the first Table, repeated those of the second*. The Ruler, blinded by self-love, replied, that he had constantly observed them all. To detect the pride and ignorance which lurked under this plausible appearance, he told him there was yet one thing wanting—he must sell all his property,

* It is remarkable that our Lord did not cite them in their original order, and that the arrangement is not the same in the three Gospels. The tenth, omitted by Luke, Matthew paraphrases by, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, and Mark translates it, *Defraud not.*

give it to the poor, and become his follower. The similar injunction of our Lord to his Apostles, *Provide neither gold nor silver in your purses*, read out in the Church at Assisi twelve centuries after it was uttered, so impressed the heart of a young enthusiast, that it led him to the foundation of the second order of Mendicant Friars, A.D. 1210; but we must not, with St. Francis, draw from it the conclusion, that a renunciation of property, and the vow of poverty, are the best means of attaining Christian perfection. This literal interpretation is not in harmony with the general teaching of our Lord; and would be a blameable throwing up of our stewardship before the time assigned by him who has said, *occupy till I come*. He only spake to the case before him; and his words as a touchstone brought forward the young ruler's besetting sin, Covetousness; and taught him, that notwithstanding his professions, his great property was dearer to him than the commands of a Teacher whom he had just denominated good.

His behaviour is a melancholy illustration of the pernicious influence of wealth, and afforded Jesus an occasion of stating the extreme difficulty and apparent impossibility of the salvation of the rich. He of course must be understood to speak generally; and the experience of every age has but too abundantly evinced, that though a few of the opulent may regard their property as a trust for which they are accountable, and make it the blessed means of relieving the distressed, and advancing their Master's cause, riches have proved to the majority an irresistible temptation to sin. The cares they bring with them have a tendency to draw off the affections from their proper object, the Creator. Hoarded, they beget covetousness; enjoyed, they encourage self-indulgence, both so fatal to spirituality; and on either supposition they nourish arrogance, and often, being trusted in for protection instead of God, make their owners guilty of a practical idolatry. The disciples, who felt only the

temptations of the poor, and seem also to have thought that the rich were more favourably situated for the attainment of future happiness, expressed their astonishment. Jesus explained, according to Luke, that he meant those who trust in their wealth; and we know, that through the influence of the Holy Spirit, it is possible to act upon the Apostle's charge^s, and to be *not high minded*, but to transfer this trust from *uncertain riches* to *the living God*. Even in that age of peculiar difficulty, a Nicodemus, a Joseph of Arimathea, a Joanna, and a Manaen, are proofs that it was not impossible for the rich to enter into the kingdom of heaven. His answer showed, that the mere possession of wealth does not necessarily exclude the proprietor; yet it was so worded as to alarm the wealthy with a sense of their danger, and to check in others the desire of owning what our great Poet calls

the toil of fools,
The wise man's cumbrance, if not snare; more apt
To slacken virtue, and abate her edge,
Than prompt her to do ought may merit praise.

Par. Regained, ii. 453.

Jesus expressed himself figuratively: *It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God*^t. Among the many indirect benefits derived from Christianity, is the correction of our

^s 1 Tim. vi. 17.

^t The saying is expressed in terms so contrary to European taste, that critics have suggested a different reading, but the use of a similar one in the Talmud shows that it is not unacceptable in the East. Κάμιλος, a cable, is substituted by Theophylact for Κάμηλος, but his conjecture is not supported by any manuscript. In Syriac and Arabic, the words as in Greek differed only in the vowels, but in the Koran it is pointed so as to mean cable. (vii. 38.) If the tradition, that a postern gate at Jerusalem was called the needle's eye, be true, it would remove the harshness of the figure; still even in the literal sense, it is not so strong as swallowing a camel.

judgment upon moral topics. Though few, perhaps, go the whole length of our Lord's determination as to the injurious tendency of wealth, none now seem disposed to rank it among those things that recommend us to the favour of God; and yet when worship consisted in sacrifice, it was natural to suppose, that he whose circumstances enabled him to make more frequent and more costly offerings, would be preferred to his poorer brother. In such an age it would be difficult to persuade men, especially the rich, that the sacrifice required by God was a *broken and a contrite spirit*, and that praise and thanksgiving would please him better than *a bullock that hath horns and hoofs*^u.

Our Lord's speech led the Apostles to reflect, that what he had enjoined they had done—left all, and followed him; and Peter with his usual forwardness, and apparently with some self-complacency, asked what would be their reward. As his motive was, however, substantially right, Jesus overlooked its alloy, and replied, that not they alone, but all who for his sake sacrificed their earthly treasure and connections, should even here, notwithstanding persecution, enjoy a hundred-fold greater happiness, even of the same kind, than others, and in the next world eternal life. To some at least of those to whom it was originally addressed, this promise may be said to have been literally fulfilled; for instead of one house which they had forsaken, wherever they made converts they found several; instead of a few

^u Ps. lxix. 31. If such were the tendency of sacrificial worship under a divine dispensation, which has carefully kept spirituality of mind in view, how pernicious must it practically prove under the corruptions of paganism. A striking illustration is afforded by this passage from a celebrated Sanscrit work, the Hitopadesa, the original of Pilpay's fables, “ Knowledge produceth humility, from humility proceedeth worthiness, from worthiness riches are acquired, *from riches religion*, and thence happiness.” What a comment upon the words, *The poor have the Gospel preached to them!*

brothers after the flesh, many spiritual ones; for sons, all whom they should convert; for possessions of their own, the use of the property of all believers; *as having nothing, and yet possessing all things!* To them especially he said, according to St. Matthew, that *in the regeneration^x*, or renewal of the world, in that *new earth in which*, purified by fire, *dwellmeth righteousness^y*, when he himself should sit on his glorious throne, they should be peculiarly honoured, for they should *sit upon twelve thrones, judging [or ruling^z] the twelve tribes of Israel.* He added, *Many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first;* and illustrated his meaning by a parable, the scope of which is not apparent, but the key to it must be sought in this saying, which is repeated at the close of it. A householder is described as going out in the dawn of the morning to hire labourers for his vineyard, and agreeing with them for the usual sum of a denarius for the day's work. Again, at the third, the sixth, the ninth, and even at the eleventh hour, he went for this purpose to the market, where then, as now, labourers in the east waited to be hired. He engaged them, but not according to the former specified rate, but for whatever he should judge right. The last (and we may presume all the intermediate ones, though as usual in parables omitted) received also a denarius. They were paid first, and in consequence those who had agreed for that sum murmured,

^x This Παλιγγενεσία, translated *Regeneration*, applying to things as well as men, may be connected with either clause of the sentence, but it is I think better suited to the second, since it was rather prepared than effected by our Lord's personal preaching; and this is supported by Mark xii. 23.

^y 2 Peter iii. 13.

^z The word will bear this sense, which here seems more appropriate. The Judges of Israel, like the Consuls of Carthage, who were distinguished by the same Phoenician title, Shophetim, rendered by Livy *Suffetes*, were not what we should call Judges, but Rulers.

and were indignant that they who had *borne the burden and heat of the day*, should be treated like those who had worked but a single hour. *May I not do what I like with mine own?* is the householder's reply. If the complaint appears to us not unreasonable, it must be because we like them have an evil eye, that is, are envious of others; and forget, that though they have worked a much shorter time in their master's service, their reward is not greater than ours; and where the service is perfect freedom, if there be any cause for regret, it is for them to lament that they were not engaged in it sooner. He who hires labourers, if he pay them their stipulated wages, cannot be charged with injustice, if out of his liberality he bestow the same as a gift upon others who work less, were it but for one hour. In the same manner our great Master, if he should grant the same remuneration to all, whether called to serve him in the morning, the noon, or the evening of life, cannot be justly blamed. It is true that some will have more cause to magnify his bounty, but none can justly complain of wrong. The parable is commonly explained of the call of the Gentiles, but the more it is examined, the less applicable does it appear to be to them in contradistinction to the Jews; though cases might be found, as indeed among the Jews too, of persons whom the knowledge of religion has reached late in life. It is applied by many to individual believers at different periods, an application which is sanctioned by eminent names. This explanation, however, is liable to great abuse; for it may lead a reader to think that he may innocently wait till hired by some special act of Providence; whereas in a Christian country, whoever has been admitted by Baptism into the Church, was then sent into the vineyard. The parable also will not suit this case, for it presupposes that those called at the eleventh hour had been idle so long unwillingly, and we may fairly suppose that they worked the more heartily, in consequence of the short duration of

their engagement. The connection of the parable with the preceding speech of the Apostle, *We have forsaken all and followed thee*, seems to limit it to the Ministers of Christ, at most to laymen appointed to particular offices. Whatever interpretation we adopt, the remark twice made, *many are called, but few are chosen*, admonishes us, that, not content with the possession of church privileges, we should *give all diligence to make our calling and election sure*. God looks not so much to the length or nature of our services as to their earnestness: he considers less what we have accomplished than what we are, what we work than what has been wrought in us. The Apostles seem to have thought, that they who were first called into our Lord's vineyard, would be necessarily more willing and more able than any that came after. He subjoined what is said on other occasions, *Many are called, but few are chosen*. Many become members of the visible Church, but they who *receive the love of the truth*, appear to have been at all times a *little flock*.

106. *Jesus again foretels his own death.* Matt. xx. 17—19.
Mark x. 32—34. Luke xviii. 31—34.

The rulers, on the resurrection of Lazarus, had issued a proclamation against Jesus. His disciples therefore were alarmed, as he was now returning to Jerusalem, in order to keep the Passover. They were indeed in immediate expectation of the establishment of his Kingdom, but they had recently heard of the difficulty of the rich entering into it, and they knew that the rulers were opposed to him. Jesus endeavoured to prepare them for the event that was to usher it in, reminding them that his ministry would close at Jerusalem, and plainly told them, what he had before obscurely intimated, that according to the Scriptures he

would be betrayed to the chief priests and Pharisees; but as they had no longer the power of inflicting capital punishment, they would deliver him up to the Gentiles, that is, to the Roman government, who would put him to death according to their custom, by crucifixion. Humanly speaking, it seemed far more probable, that instead of making his death a public and a national act, his enemies would have killed him privately. Such indeed we know was their intention; but it was overruled by God, who in his providence led them voluntarily to accomplish their object by the means which ancient Prophecy had darkly hinted, and his Son now plainly declared. He was to be mocked as a fool, to be scourged as an offender, to be spit upon as a blasphemer, and to be crucified as a criminal. His declaration, that all that he had to undergo had been foretold, ought to have strengthened their faith, especially as his suffering was to end in a triumphant Resurrection on the third day. But they did not understand him, though he had spoken without disguise, because, like the rest of his countrymen, they mistook his second advent for the first, and could not be brought to believe, till he afterwards opened their hearts to comprehend the then unwelcome truth, which they were so *slow of heart to believe*, that Christ must suffer, and then enter into his glory.

107. *The mother of James and John begs for them the highest places in the Redeemer's kingdom. Matt. xx. 20—28. Mark x. 35—45.*

Salome and her sons, thinking only of a temporal sovereignty, now came to solicit the highest places of dignity and authority. He answered, that they understood not the nature of their request, for the offices and honours he had to bestow would expose those that obtained them to a proportionate share of suffering; and he inquired if they could drink of his cup, and undergo the sufferings in which he

was about to be immersed? Either they did not comprehend his meaning, or were too self-confident, when they replied, that they were able. In answer he observed, that the honour they coveted would be conferred on those to whom it had been assigned by his Father, but that still their declaration should be fulfilled. James accordingly was the first Apostle who suffered martyrdom^a; and though his brother died a natural death at an advanced age, his sufferings were sufficient to justify the expression, he having been, according to his own testimony, in Patmos^b, *a companion of Christ's tribulation*. The request proves, that hitherto no preeminence had been promised to Peter. The ten were as ambitious as these two, and were in consequence displeased with them. Our Lord condescended to interfere, and point out the essential difference between the rulers of this world and those of his kingdom. The former domineered and tyrannized over their subjects, but whoever aspired to eminence among them, must be distinguished by humility and self-denial, and by ministering unto his brethren, if required, even to death, of which he was setting the example. He who would be great among you, let him become your servant, διάκονος, and he who would be the first, your slave, δοῦλος: and such being the way of obtaining the highest dignity in his kingdom, he might well tell these brothers, that they knew not what they asked.

108. *Jesus restores the sight of Bartimaeus. Matt. xx. 29—34.
Mark x. 46—52. Luke xviii. 35—43.*

Jesus had not taken the direct road to Jerusalem, but came by Jericho, which had been called the City of Palms, from the abundance of those trees now all but extinct in Palestine, and was then reckoned the second in importance. He seems to have passed through it, but stayed long enough to restore two blind beggars to sight. One only is men-

^a Acts xii. 2.

^b Rev. i. 9.

tioned by Mark and Luke, but they do not say that there was but one; and the discrepancy of their account from Matthew's may be explained, on the supposition that Bar Timæus, that is, the son of Timæus, who is named by Mark, was, either on his own account or his father's, the best known of the two. There is also a difference of still less importance, respecting the locality of the miracle, which, according to Luke, took place when they were near Jericho; according to the other Evangelists, as they left it; but as the three agree that Jesus was then attended by a multitude, it was most probably on leaving the town, where it seems to have collected. The son of Timæus besought Jesus as the Messiah to have pity on him, and though rebuked, he persevered in his cry till he had attracted his attention. Being called by him, he threw off the cloak in which he was wrapped, and rising up ran to meet him. He obtained the blessing that he solicited, with the assurance that he owed it to his faith; and the same faith which had restored to him his sight, conferred upon him spiritual illumination, for he followed this Son and Lord of David, praising God.

109. *He lodges at the house of Zacchæus, and relates the Parable of the Pounds.* Luke xix. 1—27.

As Jesus was passing on, Zacchæus, a chief publican, (that is, one who farmed the taxes of a district,) felt a natural curiosity to see so extraordinary a person. Being, however, *little of stature*, and unable to gratify his wish on account of the accompanying crowd, he climbed, for that purpose, into the branches of a spreading tree^c. There he not only saw, but was seen; for Jesus, looking up, invited himself to his house, which seems to have been out of the

^c Not our Sycamore, called in some places the great Maple, Acer Pseudo-Platanus, but a species of figtree bearing leaves like a Mulberry, as its name Ficus Sycomorus denotes, which is indigenous in Egypt and Palestine. The Sicamine tree is our Mulberry.

city. Upon this he immediately came down, and joyfully prepared an entertainment. The crowd murmured, because Jesus selected the house of this sinner, in preference to that of a person of greater respectability; and some commentators, partaking of the prejudices of this crowd, endeavour to show, that, if a sinner, his sin has been overrated; yet in proportion as they reduce his guilt, they lower the mercy of the Saviour, whose speech^d, concerning him, *The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost*, shows that Zacchæus was not only of reputed bad character, but at least in a degree deserved it. He stood forth in the midst of the company, avowing publicly his intention of making the most liberal compensation to any he might have defrauded; and as in many cases restitution would be impracticable, he declared his intention of giving half the remainder of his income to the poor. The confession proved his faith to be genuine, and his repentance to be sincere. He is said to be rich, and his conduct is honourably contrasted with that of the young ruler, perhaps as an instance, that what is impossible to man, is easy to him who can speak to the heart, and turn it as he will. Zacchæus called upon any whom he might have injured by false accusations, and undertook to settle with them not according to the code of his own people, which required at the most no more than restitution with the addition of a fifth^e, but four-fold, according to the more rigid determination of the Roman law.

This progress of our Lord through the holy land was more public than any former one. He was attended not only by his disciples, but also by a train of followers attracted by his miracles from all the towns through which he passed, and this, on leaving so populous a city as Jericho,

^d The context shows that *πρὸς* should be here so translated, as in Rom. x. 21.

^e Numbers v. 7.

had grown to a vast multitude. As he was now so near Jerusalem, they flattered themselves that he was at last about to assume Sovereignty; but as that was reserved for another period, and he now went up to be offered as a Sacrifice, it became expedient to correct their erroneous expectations; and as he could not do this in plain terms without declaring himself to be the Messiah, he related the parable of the Pounds, which is so contrived, that he combined in it the conduct of his opponents and his professed servants during this state of trial, with his treatment of both on his return to judgment.

Jesus accordingly described himself under the figure of a Sovereign, who sets out for a foreign country to have his title confirmed by a higher authority. Such conduct was not uncommon in that age of Roman supremacy, and the Jews had had a recent example of it in their last monarch Archelaus. Not only did he visit Rome for this purpose, but his countrymen sent an embassy to the Emperor with the hope of preventing his appointment, and were many of them, as in the parable, put to death by him on his successful return, when we may presume that he also rewarded his adherents. Thus our Lord, instead of taking immediate possession of his sovereignty, would ascend to his Father, and after a long season would come again to punish his enemies, and to reckon with his servants. To ten of these he had severally entrusted a mina, that is, not as in our translation a pound, but a sum a little exceeding three, with a charge to make profit by it. The first by trading gained ten, the second five; and the king's munificence is shown by his large recompense of the faithful employment of so small a sum. One however had carefully laid his by in a napkin, and had not only disobeyed, but vindicated his disobedience, by reproaching his Master. In Matthew's Gospel we have instead of this parable that of the Talents, so similar in its general features, that it has been considered as identical; but

though similar, it is not the same. That was told later, and only to a few of the Apostles; this to a mixed multitude, which might include future opponents, and therefore takes notice of his enemies. There is also an essential difference; in that the deposits are unequal, but the rate of profit equal, for both the five and the two talents are doubled; in this the deposits are equal, but the gain differs. Some commentators therefore understand by the Pounds, Grace, which they consider to be bestowed upon all Christians in equal measure; and by the Talents, the gifts of intellect, property, and power, which are avowedly unequally distributed, as the owner sees fit. We learn from these parables, that we are all God's servants, responsible for the grace or gifts committed to us, and for no more. The treatment of those placed over ten and five cities teaches us, that the future reward of the obedient will be in proportion to their diligence; and that of him who returned the pound as it was, that neither mean abilities nor imperfect knowledge can justify inactivity in God's service. And yet notwithstanding the warnings given them in the reply to the slothful servant, there are still persons who deem it sufficient to abstain from positive sin, and regard the gracious Giver of what they have, as a severe and unreasonable taskmaster, in requiring more than that they should not abuse his gifts; like one who should claim to reap the field which he has not sown, or to take up the pledge which he did not deposit. But this unprofitable servant was condemned out of his own mouth. The very character he falsely ascribed to his Master should have stimulated him to exertion; and if he were unable to augment his capital by trade like the first two, he would have satisfied the owner by putting out his pound to a banker, who would have returned it with interest. This we may assume had been done by the other seven, of whom we hear no more, and the alternative offered refutes his apology, and renders him inexcusable. In both parables,

the neglected sum is given to the servant who traded with most success. This in that of the Pounds excites in the king's attendants surprise, and probably displeasure; but they are assured, that it was the principle of Christ's administration to take away from those who have neglected, and to give to those who have improved, the deposit entrusted to them. From this and other passages of Scripture we may infer, that in a future life there will, as in this, be a diversity of offices. Some of these must be more important than others, but those in the lowest will be as happy as those in the highest, and if they changed places would be unhappy, since there all will be in those which are suited to their employments and ability; and he who is inferior to another in intellectual powers, will be as satisfied in performing the work assigned to him, as he who having a larger grasp of mind accomplishes grander designs.

Interest, which was applied to the appointed rate of profit, ten per cent, when the practice of profiting by the loan of money was rendered legal in our country by Henry the Eighth, is a preferable word to *Usury*, since that, having long been restricted to the amount which the law forbade as exorbitant, has acquired a bad meaning. Strange as it may seem to us who live in an age when sounder notions prevail, it is a fact, that the taking any interest was formerly universally condemned, both by moralists and political economists. Aristotle^f and his great rival Bacon^g were alike unfriendly to what the first was pleased to condemn in his *Politics*, as “ the worst and most unnatural of modes of accumulation, and the utmost corruption of artificial degeneracy, which adds nothing to the common stock, only enriching one at the expense of another;” and the second, in his *History of Henry VII.* speaks of “ good and politic laws made in Parliament against Usury, the bastard use of money^g;” though in his *Essay* on the subject, he incon-

^f *Politics*, i. 6.

^g *Life of Henry VII.* p. 66.

sistently suggests regulations for it, observing, that it is better to mitigate it by declaration, than to suffer it to rage by connivance. The School divines strangely brand it as contrary to nature as well as to revelation, and Canon Law condemns it as a mortal sin, and punishes it with excommunication. A misconception of the Mosaic prohibition, now at length understood to be a political not a moral precept, since it allowed Israelites to take interest from strangers, and moreover an excessive deference to the authority of Aristotle, have no less biassed the judgment of the earlier Protestant divines; and among our own, I know of none, previous to the Revolution, who do not regard the lending on interest, if not sinful, yet as of a questionable character^h. "Usury," says Aristotle, "by transferring merely the same object from one hand to another, generates money from money, and the interest thus generated is called *tókos*, *offspring*, as being precisely of the same nature and the same substance with that from which it proceeds." This argument, "the natural barrenness of money," is unworthy of that great philosopher, and is as valid against the rent of houses, or remuneration for a loan of any other article. He must have been misled by the etymology of *tókos*, the Greek word for *interest*, which implies that the principal generates the interest, and that it is, as, in Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice, Antonio insultingly tells Shylock, "a breed," "a breed of barren metal;" or it may be only an instance of the too common fault of seeking for reasons for a prejudice already adopted. The prejudices against taking interest for money among the ancient philosophers, were the natural result of the state of society, which fell under their observation. In countries where there is little commerce, the great motive for borrowing being necessity, the value of a loan cannot be ascertained

^h Dugald Stewart's Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers, vol. i. p. 180.

by calculation, as it may be in those where it is procured to carry on trade, and in such every money-lender will be regarded in the same odious light that a pawnbroker is with us. Whereas in those where it is borrowed for a mercantile purpose, the borrowers are often the rich, the lenders the comparatively poor. The prohibition of interest to the Jews in their mutual transactions, was in perfect consistency with the principles of their political code, which discouraged commerce, and prevented mortgages, by the indefeasible right which every man had to his land, its object being to make them an agricultural people, with as much equality in every respect as is compatible with social order. Calvin^k is, I believe, the first who confuted this sophistry, and maintained that the practice must be determined by the rule of equity. It is satisfactory to observe, that on this as on other subjects, the Word of God and the dictates of sound reason coincide; and that the former fairly examined will be found to give no countenance, even in a parable, to any erroneous position, though the best and wisest of uninspired men may have maintained it.

110. *He proceeds from Jericho to Bethany, where he is entertained in the house of Simon the Leper.* Matt. xxvi. 6—13. Mark xiv. 1—9. Luke xxii. 1—6. John xi. 47—57. xii. 1—11.

The Jews, who had gone up to Jerusalem to purify themselves preparatory to eating the Passover, sought Jesus from various motives, and asked one another if he would have courage to show himself, since a proclamation for his apprehension had been published. This decree of the council was provoked by the miraculous restoration of Lazarus to life, and did not pass unanimously, for neither Nicodemus

ⁱ In an Epistle quoted in a note in Dugald Stewart's Dissertation on the Progress of Metaphysical Ethical, and Political Philosophy, prefixed to the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica.

nor Joseph of Arimathea could have consented to it: and there might be other members who would object to so iniquitous a measure. It was obtained through the influence of the high priest, who in his official capacity avowed the maxim, that the end justifies the means, and declared that it was expedient that one person should die instead of the whole nation. He meant to speak of their temporal preservation as an independent state, and was so understood by the council; but as the Holy Spirit had formerly inspired Balaam, so it now suggested to this wicked priest words which signified that Christ should die to save from eternal death, not Israelites alone, but his whole people, which he was to gather both out of them and from the Gentiles. The rulers had determined not to put Jesus to death during the feast, for fear of a tumult; but it pleased Divine Providence, that both the mode and time of that event should be contrary to their intention, and that he, the real Victim typified by the Paschal Lamb, should be sacrificed in the most public manner during the Passover, when Jerusalem was full of worshippers; and thus the fact of his death decreed by his own nation, and confirmed and effected by the Romans, would be made known throughout the world.

Jesus, I apprehend, proceeded direct from the house of Zacchæus to Bethany, to that of Simon, surnamed the Leper, who had probably been cured by him. There is a tradition, that he was the father of Lazarus and his sisters. An entertainment now provided for Jesus caused his enemies to alter their plan. The presence of Lazarus had brought a concourse of people from the city to see Jesus, and whatever augmented his popularity at this crisis alarmed the rulers. So unscrupulous were they, that they had not only given orders for the apprehension of Jesus, but even meditated removing out of their way the person whom he had restored to life. Fear or attachment, however, prevented any from coming forward. As the Pharisees said among themselves,

they prevailed nothing, the world is gone after him. But an incident that occurred at this feast provided them with the very instrument they wanted, and the increasing popularity of Jesus caused by this miracle, satisfied them that delay would be dangerous. The sisters acted in conformity with their respective characters; for Martha assisted at table, and Mary, desirous of publicly showing her regard for Jesus, brought forth an alabaster vessel of genuine spikenard, a most fragrant and costly ointment, or rather balsam, and breaking it poured the liquor not only over his head, but also over his feet, thinking no expense that marked her admiration could be misplaced. Some of the disciples murmured at what they regarded as the waste of so precious an article; and Judas complained that it had not been sold, and the produce given to the poor, not because he cared for them, but because he kept the common purse, and [$\epsilon\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\zeta\nu$] carried off what he pleased from it, for his own use: three hundred denarii, nearly ten of our pounds, at which he estimated it, must have seemed a considerable sum to one who betrayed his Master and Friend for thirty shekels, that is, less than four. Such was the legal fine paid to the owner of a slave who had been killed accidentally by a beast*, so literally did our Lord assume *the form of a servant*; and it is the precise value which Zechariah had predicated would be set by the people of Israel upon him, who was at once their King and their God. *A goodly price that I was prized at of them*, said Jehovah¹. Our Saviour's reply intimated that they did not duly appreciate him. *Ye have the poor with you always, and whosoever ye will ye may do them good, but me you have not always.* In fact, his departure was at hand, and the act for which they had heedlessly blamed Mary, being all she could do to honour him, was so acceptable and so excellent, that it would be mentioned to her praise wherever the good news of salvation

* Exodus xxi. 32.

¹ Zech. xi. 13.

should be proclaimed^m. He added, that in so doing, she had anticipated his funeral; drawing by the remark their attention to his approaching death, and hinting that they would not have grudged the use of this costly spikenard, had they known that it was designed, as it were, for the embalment of a friend. Judas in anger retired from the entertainment, and this reproof seems to have determined him to make his bargain with the chief priests and rulers.

111. Jesus, riding on an ass's colt, proceeds in triumph to the Temple, and weeps over Jerusalem. Matt. xxi. 1—17. Mark xi. 1—19. Luke xix. 28—48. John xii. 12—50.

Our Lord now prepared to enter Jerusalem as its Sovereign, and to take, as it were, formal possession of the Temple, which was of right his Palace; but not being of the tribe that ministered at the altar, he did not enter the Sanctuary, but like other worshippers, among whom were to be classed the ancient Kings, he did not proceed beyond the inner court in which it stood. He came not, however, at this first advent, to establish an earthly monarchy, but to offer himself a victim for the sins of mankind; and every action of the five days, from his entry to his apprehension, was in harmony with his humble yet sublime character of a spiritual Deliverer. Being about to be offered up, he declared more distinctly than he had done hitherto that he was the Messiah; but that the people might not

^m Notwithstanding the opinion of Lightfoot, Whitby, Macknight, and Hales, I believe with Michaelis and Doddridge, and with other approved commentators, that this anointing, and that recorded by Matthew xxvi. and Mark xiv. are the same; conceiving it more probable that they should introduce it into another part of their Gospels, than that within four days Jesus should have been anointed by two women with the same costly ointment, that it should be valued at the same price, and the action be blamed and justified in the same words. I have here deviated from Newcome's arrangement to follow that of Doddridge.

again attempt to make him by force their King, after teaching in the day, he cautiously retired from the city at night. This Monarch, lowly both in rank and character, and though *meek* and *lowly, yet just, and having salvation*, was to enter his capital, as Zechariah had foretold almost six centuries before^o, riding upon *an ass, even a colt the foal of an ass*. For this there was an especial reason; for not only horses and chariots would have been unsuitable to his pacific character and low condition, but the king of Israel had been expressly forbidden to multiply them *to himself, or to cause his people for this purpose to return to Egypt*^p, because they were to trust in God, in whom alone *is safety*, though *a horse is prepared against the day of battle*^q. Solomon, who had broken the Law by taking to himself wives from the forbidden nations, sinned also in this minor respect; whereas his father, whose heart was perfect with God, slew the many horses he had taken from the king of Zobah^r. In the warmer climate of Palestine, the ass, which is a finer animal than in England, has been used since the time of the Judges^s by persons of distinction, and excites none of the contempt with which it is associated in our minds; yet still the preference of it may be considered as a mark of humility, and as more agreeable to the office of a Teacher. Jesus stopped at his frequent place of resort, the mount of Olives, and sent forward two disciples to procure an ass and its colt, pointing out precisely where they were to be found, and how they should settle with the owners; for so poor was this King, that even these inferior animals must be borrowed for the occasion. When brought, he mounted the unbroken^t colt, upon which no one had ever

^o Zech. ix. 9. ^p Deut. xvii. 16.

^q Sherlock's Dissertation, iv. p. 271. Prov. xxi. 31.

^r 2 Sam. viii. 3, 4. ^s Judges x. 4.

^t It seems from Matthew that he rode by turns upon both animals, *ἐπανω αὐτῶν*; but this is improbable, and Beza refers the

yet sat, the ass accompanying it, and so rendering it more governable. The crowds spread their cloaks and palm branches along the road, as was usual on a triumphal entry, greeting him with hosannas, that is, prayers that God might preserve him, as the Messiah, the Son of David, their long-expected Sovereign, and wishing him prosperity in the Psalmist's prophetic words, *Blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord; peace in heaven, and glory in the highest*^u. The crowd must have been immense, for a multitude followed him, and the *whole city was moved* to meet him. It was the resurrection of Lazarus that excited this transient popularity. His apprehension was so nigh, that Jesus no longer declined their homage; and when the Pharisees called upon him to silence the people, he assured them, that if they refused to acknowledge him, some other method would be taken of declaring him to be the King of Israel, as extraordinary as if the very stones were to cry out to proclaim him. On approaching Jerusalem, conscious though he was of the sufferings and death that there awaited him, he felt not for himself, but he wept over that infatuated and ungrateful city, which had neglected the season of his gracious visitation, and foretold its siege and destruction. We have seen Jesus in tears at the grief of Mary for her brother's death; but, as the original shows^x, his sorrow was the most profound when he anticipated the doom of his country. The event corresponded most minutely with the prophecy; as Titus, to cut off all

pronoun to the nearer antecedent *cloaks, iμαρια*; others, who consider this construction harsh, assume that the plural is employed for the singular, as in Joshua vii. 1. Matt. ii. 20. xxvii. 44. Luke xxiii. 36. and St. John xiv. 23; in which it is used of his only cloak, which was divided into four parts; a mode of expression which occurs in the works of profane writers, as in the Iliad, x. 512. Ἐπεβήσατο ιππων.

^u Psalm cxviii. 26.

^x ἐδάκρυσεν there, and ἔκλαυσεν here.

hope of safety by flight, encompassed the city, though the circuit was nearly five miles, with a trench and mound: and we learn from the Jewish historian*, that the Romans so levelled it when taken, *laying it even with the ground*, and not leaving *one stone upon another*, that they who had not seen it before would not have believed that it had been inhabited; so literally was it pressed in on every side. This *Desire of all nations*, Jehovah, the *Messenger of the Covenant*, as foretold by Malachi^y now appeared suddenly in his house, fulfilling by his presence the prophecy of Haggai^z, that this Temple should be distinguished beyond that of Solomon, since the frequent appearance of him, Jehovah incarnate, within the sacred area, was far more glorious than that of the visible symbol of the Deity overshadowing the Mercy Seat in the holy of holies. Its destruction has made its subsequent accomplishment by any other claimant of the office impossible: hence the exclamation of a celebrated Rabbi, when referring to that advent, Alas! the time of the Messiah is past! Here Christ cured all the lame and blind that came unto him, so as to excite the admiration even of the children, who joined in the general acclamation of Hosannah to the Son of David. The chief priests and scribes reproved him for accepting the homage of those whom they conceived incompetent to form a judgment; but he showed them that it was they who had drawn a false conclusion, by repeating from the Psalm, *Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise*^x; and intimated thereby, that this tribute of admiration was his due, and that it justly rebuked the silence of those, who, from age and knowledge, ought to have been the first to acknowledge him.

Certain Greeks now applied to Philip to procure them an interview with Jesus; and we know that many Gentiles,

* Josephus viii. 18.

^y Malachi iii. 1.

^z Haggai ii. 9.

^x Psalm viii. 2.

who believed in *the God of Israel*, offered sacrifice in this Temple, and attended his worship in the Synagogue; but these as they came up to keep the feast, seem to have been proselytes; still it might have been difficult, on such an occasion, even for proselytes to get access to him. Their request was communicated by Philip to Andrew, and by the two to their Master. It is not said that it was granted, nor are their motives mentioned; yet from the following speech of our Lord, whether only reported to them, or spoken in their presence, (which I think most probable,) we may infer, that, like his disciples, they expected that he was about to establish a temporal sovereignty. He declared that the hour for his glorification was arrived, yet hinted that the way lay through death, from which they ought to have concluded that it must be of a spiritual nature. He might have continued to enjoy his original glory in Heaven, *rejoicing always before his Father^a*, without condescending to take the Manhood into his Godhead, or might now resume it without suffering; but then the whole human race must perish, and the noblest of God's works, formed for an immortality of happiness, and for whom this earth had been fitted up as a suitable abode, in which the Deity might be praised and served, would have been created in vain. His philanthropy, therefore, *his delights in the sons of men^b*, made him submit to death; that as the seed, germinating in the earth, brings forth an abundant increase, so he by dying might give eternal life to his people. He added, *He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal*; calling upon those who would serve him, to follow him, and assuring them, in return, that they should be where he was, and be honoured by his Father. He thereby insinuated that these Greeks would be disappointed, if their wish had proceeded from any hope of earthly advan-

^a Prov. viii. 30.

^b Prov. viii. 31.

tage. He confessed that the prospect was distressing, and that if he yielded to natural feeling, he should pray to be saved from this hour, (for being a Man, he was tempted in all points like unto his brethren,) but he checked his aversion to suffering; he remembered that it was the very object for which he had come into the world; and as his death would glorify God by exhibiting to the admiration of the universe the union of infinite justice and mercy, which could thus alone be reconciled, he declared his entire acquiescence in his Father's will, *for this cause came I unto this hour.* The declaration was followed by the Father's own approving voice from heaven, saying, *I have both glorified my Name, and I will glorify it again;* referring to his Name having been glorified by the hosannahs of the people. Christ was attested from heaven in his three offices; on his entrance at baptism on his ministry, as the great High Priest; at his transfiguration, as the Prophet, whom all must hear; and now as King, when he had fulfilled the prophecy, *Rejoice, O Sion, behold thy King cometh.* This audible voice of God was generally accompanied, as in this instance, and in that of St. Paul's conversion, with thunder. Some who recollect from the Scriptures that their fathers were accustomed to receive communications from God, said, *an angel spake:* the people, who were not so well instructed, only thought that it thundered, and this may include the Greeks and other proselytes. He then intimated the nature of his death, and its happy and glorious result in the salvation both of Jew and Gentile. His figurative expression, *If I be lifted up,* was understood by his auditors; but they could not reconcile the idea of his death with their preconceived notion of the perpetual reign of the Messiah. He answered their question by another figure drawn from the sun, by which he directs them to make use of the light of his instruction while they had the opportunity, that they might correct their erroneous opinion.

He is now said to have concluded his teaching ; yet another short discourse follows, separated from this only by an important remark of the Evangelist^c. Some commentators consider it as a part of the former; but as it does not appear to me likely that St. John would have interrupted it to insert his own words, I agree with those who take it as a repetition of the substance of what Jesus had spoken on former occasions. In summing up his doctrine, the Evangelist declares, that Jesus had said that he had come a Light into the world, and that his words were so distinct and intelligible, that they would condemn those who rejected him, though his object was not to condemn, but to save men. That no doubt may remain, Jesus concluded with saying, that his doctrine was not his own invention, but received from his Father; revealed without addition or diminution, and that he knew that eternal life depended upon the belief of it. The sum and substance, the beginning and end of his teaching, contained, according to Tittmann^d, four primary articles, which cannot be denied by any who profess the name of Christ: the first, that he was God's Ambassador, sent for the salvation of mankind; the second, that he was one with the Father, in respect not only of will but of works, and therefore in nature, in a word, the Son of God; the third, that he was the Saviour, who was to procure salvation for all, and to bestow eternal life on believers; and the fourth, that his doctrine was infallibly true. St. John interposes between these two discourses the observation, that even the many miracles of his Master had not induced the Jews to believe in him. He reminds the reader that this result had been foretold, and in applying the prophecy he unequivocally asserts the divinity of Jesus. His words are memorable, *Isaiah said this when he saw his glory, and spake of him.* Now if we turn to the sixth chapter, from

^c John xii. 37—43.

^d On St. John's Gospel, vol. ii. p. 79.

which he cites, we shall find, that the person, whose glory the Prophet saw, was the *Lord of Hosts*, Jehovah Sabaoth, that is, the everlasting Deity, Creator and Governor of the world. May the Anti-Trinitarian meditate upon this apostolical interpretation of the Prophet, to adopt the language of a devotional author, and when he refuses to worship Jesus, consider what satisfactory explanation he can offer of the passage. “To me it appears,” says Newton, “as plain as words can make it, that Jesus is *the Lord of Hosts*; and I am well satisfied, that it will not be a burden to any at the hour of death, nor be laid to their charge at the day of judgment, that they have thought too highly of him, or laboured too much in setting him forth to others *as the Alpha and Omega, the true God, and eternal life*.” In the evening Jesus withdrew to Bethany, we may suppose to the family of Lazarus.

112. *He condemns the barren fig-tree, and once more purifies the Temple.* Mark xi. 12—19. Matt. xxii. 45—48.

The next morning, coming into Jerusalem early, probably without having eaten, Jesus being hungry went up to a fig-tree which grew by the road. The season of gathering figs had not arrived, and Jesus might reasonably expect to find some fruit, as it is formed before the leaves, and this tree having the latter, might be said to promise the former. On approaching, however, he found the promise was deceitful. Condemning it therefore not for its barrenness, but its false show of fruitfulness, he said, *Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever;* and it withered to the root. This, like other of his miracles, conveyed a meaning; it was the parable of the barren fig-tree exhibited to the senses. Chrysostom observes, that he wished to show that punishment

■ Cardiphonia.

would overtake the nation that rejected him; and because his dispensation was that not of justice, but of mercy, he selected not a man but a tree. His mercy he prefigured by numberless miracles of kindness; his judgments on the unfruitful, by a single sign inflicted on a useless and senseless plant. Like this fig-tree, the Jewish nation, professing zeal for the divine law, had at a distance a promising appearance; but upon a nearer inspection, was found to be destitute of its fruits. Not profiting by the advantages of which it boasted, it would be condemned in like manner as unproductive, and cumbering the ground, because it did not know and profit by the day of its visitation. Awfully has the type been realised, in the dispersion and misery of God's once chosen people; yet *as mercy rejoiceth against judgment*, the parallel is not complete; for Israel, so long *a dry tree, shall be grafted again into its own stock*, and bring forth abundant fruit; for it is *as the teil tree and the oak, whose substance is in them, when they cast their leaves*^f.

Jesus again entered the Temple, and once more, at the close of his ministry as at its commencement, turned out the buyers and sellers, but with a severer rebuke; for he then charged them with turning *into a house of merchandise* this sacred building, which was designed to be *a house of prayer*: he now said, *Ye have made it a den of robbers*. The contrast between its intended use, and their gross profanation of it, must have struck them the more, as it was not an original remark, but was the application of two passages from the Prophets Isaiah^g and Jeremiah^h. The reference to the latter was well suited to awaken these self-righteous formalists from their false security, for it was connected with a threat, that the Lord would do unto this house as he had done to Shiloh, where he set his Name at the first, in which their fathers had put their trust; and that he would cast them out of his sight, as he had already cast

^f Isaiah vi. 13.

^g Isaiah lvi.

^h Jer. vii. 11.

out the ten tribes. That sin might provoke him to cast off his people, had been proved by his suffering the king of Babylon to carry them into captivity; and this reference intimated that there would be another fulfilment of the prophecy. The speech in which Josephusⁱ, before that generation had passed away, endeavoured to persuade the inhabitants of Jerusalem to surrender, is the best commentary upon our Lord's declaration. "The temple itself is become the receptacle of all crimes, and this divine place is polluted by our own countrymen, while it is reverenced by the Romans. And, after all this, do you expect him, whom you have treated so impiously, to be your supporter?" Jesus continued the whole day in the Temple teaching in its courts, while the scribes and other leading persons lay in wait to destroy him, but in vain, as the people listened to his instructions with astonishment and respect. At night he again retired from the city.

113, 114. His Discourse in the Temple with the Chief Priests, the Scribes, and the Elders. Matt. xxi. Mark xi. xii. Luke xx.

The following day as they passed by, Peter drew the attention of Jesus to the withered fig-tree; and he availed himself of the occasion, to exhort them to a lively and intense faith, assuring them, that if they had no misgiving, they too should perform even greater miracles than this. He added, what is of perpetual application, that the prayer of faith will be answered; but that when we pray, if we would obtain pardon, we must first ourselves pardon those that have trespassed against us.

As Jesus now appeared openly as the Messiah, the leading persons demanded on what authority he acted, in having entered the Temple with such a train of attendants, and taken upon him to regulate the conduct of those who

ⁱ Wars, v. 9.

frequented it; an office beyond the province of a private individual, and justifiable only in the Messiah as the representative of its Master. Instead of a reply which would have caused his immediate apprehension, he engaged to tell them, if they would first answer whether John's Baptism was a divine or a human institution? They could not answer in the affirmative, without acknowledging Jesus for the Messiah, for as such John had announced him; and they dared not in the negative, for the people, who believed the Baptist to be a prophet, would in indignation have stoned them. They therefore affected ignorance, and by this plea allowed their incompetence to judge of such topics. He then proceeded to warn them, affording them one more opportunity of repentance, but under the veil of parables, which, while it was too transparent to conceal his meaning, rendered it in a degree less offensive, and sheltered him from the consequences which would have followed from a plain and open statement of the truth.

The first was that of two sons, whom their father desired to work in his vineyard, one of whom rudely refused, but afterwards went; the other readily assented, but stayed away. This intimated, that the profligate part of the nation would be brought to repentance and obedience, while those who had the form of godliness without the reality would reject his teaching, notwithstanding their specious professions; and experience proves, that it represents the characters of all times and countries. By asking their opinion, Jesus made them condemn themselves; but it seems that they were not aware of this, till he made a direct application; *Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.* The second represented the nation at large under the image of a vineyard, familiar to them from its occurrence in the Old Testament, yet with special reference to their rulers and teachers, as husbandmen to whom it had been let. Their peculiar privileges as a

Church were entrusted to them, in order that they might abound in good works; but when God was no longer present among them by external displays of power, as on the promulgation of the Law, they forgot that they were accountable to him; the Prophets, whom he sent from time to time to call them to repentance, they had ill treated, or killed out of hatred to their Master; and they were now about to fill up the measure of their crimes by the murder of his Son. Not immediately perceiving the drift of the parable, they answered, that these wretches would be put to a wretched death, and the means of grace be transferred to those who would make a proper use of them. He confirmed their observation; and as Nathan said to David, *Thou art the man*, he added, *The kingdom of heaven shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof*. But first, to show that he did not speak from himself, he asked if they had never read, *The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner*: a passage from the very Psalm in the words of which the multitude had so lately greeted him. He warned them, that whoever should fall upon this stone, would suffer like one who stumbles and breaks his limbs, yet may recover; but he on whom the stone itself should fall, would by its weight be ground to powder; thereby contrasting the lesser punishment of one who only rejects him, with the heavier that awaits his enemies. They now discovered his meaning, which only exasperated them; but they were afraid of seizing him. He therefore proceeded to exhibit their rejection of him, their consequent ruin, and the transferring of their privileges to the Gentiles, in the parable of a marriage-feast, given by a king in honour of his son. We have had a similar one in Luke's gospel, but in this we have the important addition, that not only those who stayed away, but that some also of those who were admitted in their stead, were unworthy. It is the custom

in the East, and had been as early as the time of Joseph^k, for kings and others of high rank to bestow robes upon those whom they delight to honour; we read of it in modern books of travels, and the parable of the prodigal son proves it to have prevailed in the time of our Lord^l. A wedding garment, no doubt, was provided for each guest; for it could not be expected, that travellers should come properly habited for an entertainment to which they were so unexpectedly invited. One person, however, satisfied with his own apparel, rejected the proffered robe, and remained unnoticed, till the King entered to inspect the company. His arrival flashed upon him a conviction of his unfitness; for being questioned how he came there, he was speechless, which he would not have been if he had had any excuse to offer. Calvin observes, that though God requires holiness in order to our receiving the benefits of the Gospel, he is graciously pleased to work it in us by his Holy Spirit, and may consequently justly resent and punish our neglect of so great a favour. The unworthy guest was therefore excluded, and punished for not conforming to the rules of the banquet, by being thrown into a dark dungeon, where weeping and vexation were his portion. The parable teaches, that hypocrites will intrude among believers, and remain in the Church till detected at the last day by the heart-searching God. At that day, when the marriage of the Lamb is celebrated, believers will be arrayed in *fine linen, clean and white*, which we know typifies the *righteousness of saints^m*; and this wedding garment is assumed to be personal righteousness in the first Exhortation of our

^k Gen. xlvi. 22.

^l This custom would lead the wealthy to keep stores of robes, and explains the representing the perishable nature of earthly treasure as being liable to injury from moths as well as from rust. Matt. vi. 19. James v. 2.

^m Rev. xix. 8.

Communion Service. It is also Calvin's interpretation; but other commentators take it for the Saviour's imputed righteousness, which agrees better with the opinion, that the habit required was a gift from the master of the feast. The Fathers give sometimes the one and sometimes the other interpretation; nor are they in this inconsistent, for imputed and inherent righteousness, that is, Justification and Sanctification, are inseparable, and seem to differ only as cause and effect; and the Church, that is, the congregation of believers, is described by the Psalmist as possessing both under the figure of a bride, who is *all glorious within, and has also her clothing of wrought gold*^a. The metaphor of a robe is applied to both in the New Testament. *Put off the old man, and put on the new*^b; *Put on the Lord Jesus*^c; are the exhortations of Paul: and, *I counsel thee to buy of me white raiment*, says our Lord^d to the Church of Laodicea: and an elder told St. John, that those whom he saw clothed with white robes had *washed them, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb*^e.

115. The Pharisees and Herodians, the Sadducees, and a Scribe, put cases to Jesus for his decision, which he determines without committing himself, and in return, silences them by one question. Matt. xxii. Mark xii. Luke xx.

The chief priests, scribes, and elders, had come, by order of the Sanhedrin, to examine the pretensions of Jesus; but their scheme of forcing him to a declaration, which would have put him in their power, issued in their own confusion. They attempted in vain to *entangle him* by their questions, and the one he in return put to them, silenced them for ever. They differed widely among themselves, yet agreed in the wish to ensnare him; and therefore having previously consulted together, came in

^a Psalm xlv. 13.

^b Eph. iv. 24.

^c Rom. xiii. 14.

^d Rev. iii. 18.

^e Rev. vii. 14.

succession to put controverted cases, which he could not decide either way without giving offence to some. First came the Pharisees and Herodians, who, feigning themselves to be just and scrupulous, accosted him with an hypocritical deference, asking, as a case of conscience, if they might pay the Roman tribute without a breach of the Law. The Pharisees inferred, from the prohibition to make a stranger their sovereign, the unlawfulness of such payment, and of course their opinion was popular. The contrary was maintained by Herod's partisans, who made religion subservient to policy. If Jesus had directed them to pay the tribute, the former would have represented him as opposing the Law, advocating the cause of idolaters, and even renouncing the office of Messiah, who they expected would deliver them from foreign servitude ; if he declared it illegal, the latter would have charged him with treason. The dilemma, affecting his reputation or even life, it seemed impossible to escape, and yet he extricated himself from their toils, simply by taking advantage of their own concession, that the denarius bore the Emperor's *image and superscription*; and of their tradition, that the country in which a king's coin was current, was justly subject to his government. In the same short speech he taught the turbulent and seditious demagogues, the Pharisees, to render unto Cæsar Cæsar's dues, which they refused ; and the licentious and irreligious courtiers, the Herodians, to render unto God his, which they neglected ; thus publicly, but obliquely, in a way that neither could take any hold of, reproofing both, and conveying instruction of universal application on the duties of men to God and to the State, without deciding upon forms of government.

The Sadducees, who disbelieved not only the Resurrection of the body, but the Immortality of the soul, next came to perplex him with a common-place objection, derived from a man's obligation to marry the widow of a brother who had

died childless. When asked by the Pharisees respecting worldly matters, he, whose kingdom was not from this world, did not choose to interfere; but when the Sadducees moved a question concerning eternal life, he showed that it did not become him to be silent. He reproved their ignorance on a double account: *ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.* First, he removed the ground of their objection, by declaring, that as in the next world men would be like the angels in immortality, they would not marry, as there would be no need of keeping up a number that would never diminish; secondly, he showed that the existence of the soul after death was implied in the Law^t. Some think that he chose a text out of the Pentateuch, because the only portion of the Bible acknowledged by the Sadducees, but the truth of that opinion is doubtful; and it seems a better reason to assign, that he thought fit to answer them out of the very author from whom they brought their objection. Many passages from the Psalms and the Prophets might of course have been cited, in which the doctrines they rejected were more plainly revealed; but Jesus confined himself to explaining the belief of Moses, and this he effected, first, by observing that their quotation did not prove their point; and, secondly, by showing, that what he had recorded in another place, fully and clearly disproved it. As *maintaining a position*, he might have chosen a clearer text; but if we consider him as a *respondent*, defeating a subtle and plausible objection, he could not have done it more effectually. Jehovah had announced himself to Moses out of the burning bush, as the *God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;* and he added, *This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.* The last of these had then been dead near two thousand years, and still Jehovah was *their God.* Is he then a God of lifeless clay, of dust and

^t Waterland's Sermon on the text.

ashes? Surely this could be supposed by none: when God therefore declared himself to be their God, they must have been still alive, and in a state of enjoyment; consequently the soul survives the body, for *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*

The Sadducees were silenced, the Scribes applauded, and the people assented to his reasoning; yet to many now, the answer does not seem to go directly to the proof of the Resurrection. These persons however forget, that as the Sadducees denied the Immateriality of the soul, their disbelief of the Resurrection was the disbelief of a Future State; and if Jesus proved no more than the soul's subsisting after death, he still proved enough for his purpose. But the thread of argument with which he began, leads by just and necessary consequence to the Resurrection of the body. It implied, that their God will finally render them completely happy, and therefore it presumes the reality of the Resurrection; for as man was originally made a compound being, the body must not be regarded, as it was by philosophers, as a prison from which the soul longs to escape, or as a slave to be chastised, but as an essential part of his nature; and as death was the punishment of sin, and as every one remaining under that sentence still carries about with him in his mortality the mark of Divine displeasure; the immortal spirit though in Paradise cannot be perfectly happy, till reunited with its original companion. That companion has received a taint from the fall of Adam; and too often tempts the soul which sojourns in it to sins of the flesh, while in return it is made by the soul an instrument to gratify the malignant passions. Still it has been ennobled by its union with our Lord and elder brother, who, now in complete human nature, of which he never will divest himself, occupies at his Father's right hand a mediatorial throne; and hereafter the bodies of Christ's members, though continuing essentially the same, will undergo a greater

change than we can now even imagine, since he will fashion them into the likeness of his own *glorious body*, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue even all things unto himself. The body will then no more weigh down the spirit through its infirmity, and will no longer tempt it to sin, but it will become incorruptible and spiritual; not purified like that of Adam, as it came fresh from the hands of its Maker, but even assimilated to that of Christ, which as the reward of his obedience has been glorified.

Our popular literature more often embodies the speculations of heathen philosophy than the truths of holy writ: and therefore our authors, sometimes even those on religion, forget, that the Resurrection of the body is as much an article of the Creed, as Life everlasting. This fundamental truth, the exclusive property of Revelation, was deemed so incredible, that when preached by Paul at Athens, it exposed him to scorn and ridicule; the latter, though properly believed by few, was no new proposition in the city of Socrates and Plato. It was, however, encumbered and injured by its connection with another doctrine, which we know from revelation to be false, the pre-existence of the Soul. The heathen philosophers, who allowed that the Deity had brought the Universe into form and shape, could not conceive how any part of it could have been created out of nothing. Matter therefore was with them eternal; and spiritual beings, such as the Soul, were not the creatures of God, but emanations from him, consequently portions of his Essence. The Soul accordingly must in itself be pure; but as the existence of sin is undeniable, its origin must be found in the Body. The perplexity which the existence of evil occasioned to thinking minds, unenlightened from above, originated the belief of the inherent imperfection of Matter; and this was a prolific source of error, both in doctrine and practice. Hence proceeded the notion, that the Union of Body and Soul was

a misfortune, and the punishment of some offence committed in a pre-existent state. The Soul was supposed to be degraded by its confinement in a material dungeon, which cramped its faculties and impaired its purity; it was taught to long to break the chain which prevented it from soaring to its native skies; and as the Body was enfeebled by disease or age, it was supposed to improve, in proportion, both in intelligence and purity. This Pagan fancy is so interwoven into our language and thoughts, that an irrational importance has been attached to dying words, “*novissima verba;*” and Christians have often expressed in prose the sentiment of the Poet Waller,

The soul’s dark cottage, batter’d and decay’d,
Lets in new light through chinks that time has made.

It followed from this theory, that the Body was not only to be brought into subjection by abstinence and penance, but to be debarred even of its legitimate gratifications; and to those whose lives were passed in its mortification, and who looked forward with hope to an ultimate emancipation from it, the doctrine, that this companion of the Soul, to which they fondly ascribed their sinful propensities, would be raised from the grave, and put on immortality, was at once absurd and revolting. Such persons could never be brought to believe, that the Deity had originally created Matter, or that the Son of God had more than an apparent Body. Hence they denied both the Incarnation and Crucifixion, and, like some of the Corinthians, believed that the Resurrection was past already, being no more than a figurative rising out of sin into newness of life. Yet it is upon the fact of our Saviour’s rising in a human body, that our hope of immortality rests; the philosophical doctrine is only a pleasing dream: the earliest scriptural declaration is that of Job, that *in his flesh* he shall see his Redeemer: and the custom among savage nations of slaying the attendants and horses of a dead chief, and the Egyptian practice of em-

balming, seem to indicate, that before the introduction of Philosophy, Tradition had handed down the hope of Immortality, as connected with the restoration to life of the Body.

There have been Christians, and among them writers of eminence, who maintain, that even the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul was at least generally unknown to the Israelites under the Mosaic dispensation; and that this most powerful motive to obedience, and only genuine source of consolation, while suffered to transpire among heathens, was studiously concealed from the chosen people of God. It is amazing, that any one, recollecting this answer to the Sadducees, could have started such a paradox; but no diligent and humble reader of the Bible will be disposed to give it credit. He knows from inspired authority^u, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who *sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country* ($\gamma\eta\nu$), waited in faith for a better country of their own ($\pi\alpha\tau\gamma\delta\alpha$), *wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God*; and that Moses, when he might have enjoyed *the pleasures of sin*, as the adopted son of the Egyptian princess, despised all that rank and power could ensure him, because he *had respect unto the recompense of the reward*, which it is plain must have been after death. He readily allows, that, for wise and obvious reasons, the Legislator did not, and indeed could not, make eternal life the sanction of his *National Laws*; yet he cannot think that he would withhold from his people the knowledge of a doctrine, which we know was his own support and principle of action^x. With the Apostle^v, we should gratefully acknowledge, that it is Jesus Christ, who through the Gospel has brought to us a clear and distinct view of life and immortality, which before had not been so distinctly revealed; but we also believe, that our Church has truly affirmed in the VIIth Article, “that both in the Old and

^u Heb. ix.

^x Heb. xi. 24—26.

^y 2 Tim. i. 10.

New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ; and that they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises."

A lawyer, who was a Pharisee, next came forward to try Jesus, by enquiring which was *the first commandment of all*. This was a question at that time much debated among their doctors. The Sabbath, the Rules concerning Meats, those regarding Purification, and those which directed Sacrifices, had their respective eager advocates. Jesus disappointed all by quoting the emphatic words of Moses, *Hear, O Israel^a: Jehovah our God is one Jehovah: and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength*: and adding, *This is the first commandment: and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*. The love of God thus defined is not a mere contemplative feeling, but an active, energetic principle, which will constrain him who is really influenced by it to render a ready and cheerful obedience to whatever God has commanded, because he has commanded it. No Jew, therefore, could be reasonably displeased with an answer which was actually taken from their Law; and a sincere love of God would be the best security for keeping the rules respecting the Sabbath, Purification, Sacrifice, or whatever else he had enjoined. *On these two commandments*, Jesus continued, *hang all the Law and the Prophets*. Fear may prevent many infractions of the Law, but Love alone will ensure a constant obedience; and he who loves God will necessarily love his neighbour, and that will secure the due performance of both positive and negative precepts; for, as St. Paul argues in his Epistle to the Romans^b, every *commandment is briefly comprehended in this saying: therefore Love is the fulfilling of the Law*. The discrimination in the degree of love required with respect to God and man, deserves our most serious attention. Self-love is to be the

^a Deut. vi. 4, 5.

^b Rom. xiii. 8—10.

measure of our love of our neighbour, but no measure is assigned to our love of God, whom we are required to make the supreme and primary object of our affections. Nor will this be deemed a strained interpretation by any who consider, that in our Lord's form of prayer we are taught to put up three petitions for the advancement of our Father's glory, before we ask for our daily bread. No terms indeed can be stronger, nor can *heart* and *soul* mean less than all the faculties of the understanding, and all the affections. Nor is this all; it is added, *with all thy strength*, which is generally understood to mean, with all thy energy, or in the highest possible degree, but the original is, with all that is thine; and this, both in the Syriac version and the Chaldee paraphrase, is rendered, with all that thou hast, that is, with all thy property. And this on reflection will appear to be the true meaning, as the other is tautological, since all our strength is included in all the heart and all the soul. The Scribe, struck with admiration, candidly acknowledged he had answered well, and that to keep these commandments as Jesus had stated them, was better than all *burnt offerings and sacrifices*, indeed than the whole Mosaic ritual, which this cardinal precept could alone enable a man to fulfil. He in return assured the Scribe, that he was *not far from the kingdom of God*. We must suppose, therefore, that either he came originally as a sincere enquirer, or was by our Lord's speech brought to a right frame of mind. We have already had the testimony of Jesus to these commandments, in his conversation with another lawyer, whom he taught the comprehensive nature of the second, by the tale of the good Samaritan.

And now, having baffled their devices, Christ in his turn, to try their knowledge of the Law, put to them a question, Whose Son they conceived the Messiah to be? They answered, without hesitation or suspicion of his drift, *The Son of David*. This he followed up by a second, How

David, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, then could acknowledge him for a superior, which he did by calling him his Lord? Had this son been a mere man, with what propriety could he bestow this title on a remote descendant, so inferior in all outward circumstances, to whom he could owe no obedience, and who would have no existence till a thousand years after his death? This they were unable to answer; nor will any have better success who deny the divinity of David's Son and Lord, of him, who is at once *the root and the offspring* of his progenitor, the descendant of that king of Israel according to the flesh, but whose goings forth *have been of old, from everlasting*^c. The orthodox scheme alone can solve this seeming paradox. With this question Jesus finally silenced his insidious enemies, whose ingenuity, though not their malice, was exhausted. He thus effected one great object of his public teaching, the exposure of them to the multitude, who *heard him gladly*; and to those who had *ears to hear*, he had afforded matter for meditation on the real character of the Messiah, and on his own title to the office.

116. Jesus sharply reproves the Scribes and Pharisees, and finally leaves the Temple. Matt. xxiii.

Jesus then turned to the multitude, and cautioned them to observe the instructions of the Scribes and Pharisees as authorized teachers, but not to imitate their practice, as they contrived by plausible pretences to evade the performance of the duties they enjoined. He also warned them against their love of applause, and pursuit of worldly honours and distinctions; and, being no longer under restraint from fear of their seizing him before his time, he exposed, without reserve, the hypocrisy of these blind guides, and the pernicious casuistry with which they explained away the moral law, and endeavoured to compensate

^c Micah v. 2.

for the omission of their highest duties, as justice, charity, and fidelity, by a scrupulous performance of the minutest external injunctions, such as the tithing of garden herbs. *Blind guides* he called them, applying to them what seems to have been a proverbial expression, *ye strain out^d a gnat*; lest in drinking they should unaware pollute their draught by its containing a minute fly, while without scruple they swallowed a camel, the largest animal known in Judæa. *They omitted the weightier matters of the Law*, to be punctilious in the observance of its ceremonial minutiae. In condemning their dispensing with oaths, he confuted their sophistry by declaring, as in the Sermon on the Mount, that every oath, the matter of which is lawful, is obligatory, because swearing by the creature, is virtually an appeal to the Creator. He reproached them with hypocritically condemning their forefathers, who had killed the ancient prophets, by repairing their tombs; while by their intended persecution of himself and his disciples, they showed that they resembled them in character, and he called upon them to fill up the measure of their national guilt by destroying him. His language intimated, that there is a certain measure to which a nation's iniquity is allowed to rise, and that before punishment is inflicted, it must be filled up by succeeding generations adding their own crimes to those of preceding ones. He at the same time declared, they had brought their ruin upon themselves, for he had sent unto them from time to time prophets and instructors, and had ever been ready to protect them, as the parent bird gathers her brood under her wings. He ended with a solemn assurance, that their house, that is the Temple, would be deserted, that they should be cast out of their Church, and

^d Διωλίζοντες is thus correctly rendered in the Rhemish Testament. *Strain at*, for which it is difficult to find a meaning, but to which use has reconciled us, is a typographical error of the first edition of the authorized version.

excluded from the privileges of his people, and should see him no more till they adopted the language which they now condemned in the people, and welcomed him as the Messiah, blessing him that came in the name of the Lord. With this prediction of their rejection and dispersion, and their future conversion, he closed his ministry, and for ever quitted the Temple.

This is by far the most animated of all our Lord's discourses, and the most likely to give offence. It could not fail of astonishing the people, who looked up to their teachers with reverence. And even those against whom it was levelled were confounded: they knew not what course to take, and so let him go quietly away, without attempting to lay hands upon him, as they had sometimes done before upon much less provocation.

117. He prefers the widow's mite, because her all, to the large sums given out of their superfluity by the rich.
Mark xii. 41—44. Luke xx. 1—4.

However, before departing, Jesus noticed the persons who were putting money into the chest, placed in the court in which he had been speaking, for the reception of voluntary contributions towards the expenses of the Temple; and bore testimony to the charity of a widow, who threw in two mites, a sum less than our farthing, the smallest that was allowed to be given, and all that she possessed. This our Teacher pronounced to be a greater gift than the large donations of the rich, who only gave out of their superfluity, whereas she had retained nothing to purchase necessary food, for which she depended upon her own labour, or precarious charity. The incident conveys an useful lesson both to the poor and rich; it encourages the poor to do what they can, because God, who looks into the heart, values the gift according to the disposition of the giver; and it impresses upon the rich a lesson, that has been taught

even by heathen moralists, that it is not enough that their alms be large, for not the amount, but its proportion to their means, is the measure of their liberality. It is to be feared, however, that many whom men commend for liberality, assign what He will not consider as a due proportion. Respect for him who praised this widow, prevents any from condemning her bounty; but bounty far inferior to hers has been censured by the rich as improvident; and the poor are too apt to forget, that the fact is recorded for their imitation, I do not say literally, but in the spirit. The duty has never been more powerfully enforced than by St. Paul, who urges it as a motive for diligence in our calling. *Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labour, that he may have to give to him that needeth*^e.

118. *Jesus, on leaving the Temple, foretels its destruction, and afterwards on the mount of Olives declares to four of his Apostles the signs that shall precede his second coming.* Matt. xxiv. xxv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi.

The disciples, as they were departing, endeavoured to draw their Master's attention to the magnificence of the Temple, meaning thereby to intimate their regret as well as wonder at its predicted destruction. Jesus simply replied, that the time was coming when there should not be left *one stone upon another that should not be cast down*. No event could at the time appear less probable, for the Romans had as yet no motive to injure one of their own provinces; and when Jerusalem was taken after a siege of nearly five months, Titus, on entering, and looking up at the fortifications which the Jews had abandoned, exclaimed, Surely we have had God for our assistant, for what could human hands or machines do against these towers! He was anxious to save the Temple, out of regard to its sanctity, or the wish of preserving such a distinguished ornament of the Empire;

^e Ephes. iv. 28.

but the pertinacity of the infatuated people, and the fury of his own soldiers, were the means through which the Almighty defeated his purpose. The Jews themselves first set fire to *God's holy and beautiful house*, and then the Romans; and the general's endeavours to extinguish the flames were unavailing: yet he was able in part, by personal exertion, to save the Golden Candlestick, the Shew-Bread Table, and other sacred furniture, which adorned his and his father's triumph, and which we at this distant day may see sculptured on the still remaining memorial of the fall of Judæa—his Arch in the Roman Forum. The very foundations of Jerusalem were afterwards dug up in search of buried treasure; and the words of Micah^f were literally fulfilled, *for your sake shall Zion be ploughed up as a field, and Jerusalem become heaps.* Our Lord's prophecy also was most exactly verified about forty years after it had been uttered; and it is not a simple prediction of the fact, but consists of a variety of particulars, such as the city being surrounded with a trench, the unparalleled misery of the besieged, and the complete destruction both of town and Temple; which could never have been predicted in all its particulars, except by a true Prophet, and the literal fulfilment of which would never have been known, unless it had pleased Providence to preserve to us the best commentary upon it, in the minute detail of the siege, by Josephus, who was in the Roman camp, never embraced Christianity, and might not have heard of the prediction. He had the best opportunity of acquiring information, and his notorious flattery of the Romans would prevent his exaggerating their cruelty.

When they had withdrawn to the Mount of Olives, where they were alone, his three confidential disciples and Andrew asked when these things should be, and what should be the sign of his coming, and of the end of the age which was to

^f Micah iii. 12.

follow. Great, says Dr. Hales, has been the embarrassment and perplexity of commentators concerning the meaning of this enquiry; and four hypotheses are still afloat on the subject. The first confines the whole enquiry to the approaching destruction of Jerusalem; the second connects with it Christ's second advent in the Regeneration, according to Jewish expectation; the third substitutes for this advent his last, accompanied with the general judgment; and the fourth, which unites all the preceding in the answer to the three questions, Hales himself supports. Certainly several of the phrases are, according to our ideas, more suitable to the final and more important coming of the Son of Man at the last day, to judge the whole human race, than his coming through the agents of his Providence, the Roman Legions, to take vengeance on his apostate people, and to terminate the Jewish dispensation. Still our Lord's positive declaration, that the existing generation should not pass away till all these things were fulfilled, necessarily limits such expressions, as the darkening of the sun and moon—the falling of the stars—and the shaking of the powers of heaven—and even the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds with great glory—to the destruction of Jerusalem; nor is the use of these figures to denote a temporal calamity, so harsh and bold, as it may appear to persons not so familiar as the disciples must have been, with the language of ancient prophecy^g. Bishop

^g Isaiah describes the future fall of Babylon in the same imagery, (chap. xiii. 9, 10, 13.) *Behold, the day of the Lord cometh—for the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine;*—therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place. And chap. xxxiv. 4. *The heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down as the leaf falleth off from the vine.* Joel says, (ii. 31.) that *the sun shall be turned into darkness, and*

Porteus maintains, that the whole twenty-fourth chapter, in its primary acceptation, relates to the destruction of Jerusalem, but that the images are for the most part applicable also to the day of judgment, and that an allusion to that great event, as a kind of secondary object, runs through almost the whole prophecy. He observes, that in the like manner, there are no less than three subjects, the restoration of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, the call of the Gentiles, and the redemption by the Messiah, so intimately blended together in Isaiah's prophecies, that it is extremely difficult to separate them; and that so our Saviour seems to hold out the destruction of Jerusalem, his principal subject, as a type of the dissolution of the world, which is the under-part of the representation. By thus mingling together these two important catastrophes, he gives at the same time, according to the Bishop, a most interesting admonition to his hearers, and an awful lesson to his future disciples; and thus the benefit of his predictions, instead of being confined to a few contemporary believers, is extended to every age. It is certain that it was the common belief, that the destruction of Jerusalem and the general judgment, if they did not synchronize, could not be far apart; and this belief led these apostles to put the questions together. My own opinion is, that the two events are kept distinct; and that our Lord, after answering the first, avails himself of the opportunity of preparing them for his final judgment; the first was to happen within the lifetime of some of that generation, but *of that [later] day knoweth no man^h*; and

the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. Coming in the clouds sometimes means not the personal appearance of the Deity, but his manifestation by some signal act of Providence: as, *Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt.* Isaiah xix. 1. And the Psalmist exclaims, *The Lord bowed the heavens also, and came down.* Psalm xviii. 9.

^h Matt. xxiv. 34—36.

that this transition commences, as Doddridge maintains, with the exhortation to watch, as they know not at what hour their Lord cometh; *Therefore be ye also ready*ⁱ. The prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem was of peculiar importance to believers of that generation, since their preservation from the miseries of a protracted siege, and from death, depended upon their observing the signs of the times, and acting on their Saviour's advice, to escape with the least possible delay. Others place the transition at the declaration, that *of that day knoweth no one but the Father*; but though this may be truly predicated of both events, the context, *one shall be taken and another left*, seems to fix it to the earthly judgment. It is therefore recorded by the first three Evangelists; two of whom direct attention to Daniel's figurative prediction, *Whoso readeth, let him understand*; while the prediction is by Luke thus plainly interpreted, *When ye see Jerusalem encompassed by armies*. As John's is subsequent to the event, he has no allusion to it. By the special providence of God, when the Romans first advanced against Jerusalem under Cestius Gallus, though they had even burnt a part of the city, they suddenly withdrew under an unaccountable panic. At this Josephus expresses his surprise, as the place might have been taken immediately; and adds, the wickedness of the people suffered not the war to terminate, and certainly their successful pursuit of the enemy mainly contributed to their own ruin, since it both exasperated the Romans, and buoyed them up with a false confidence. But there was a purpose to be answered by the irresolution of the general, unknown to the Jewish historian; for the Christians, mindful of their Lord's admonition, withdrew to Pella, and other places beyond the Jordan; so, as ecclesiastical history informs us, not one of them perished in the siege. Josephus also

states, that many distinguished Jews then withdrew, as they would have left a sinking ship.

Our Lord began with naming the Signs^k that should precede his coming to take vengeance upon Jerusalem, all of which we know from history were accurately fulfilled : 1. False Messiahs, who deluded many to their destruction ; 2. *Wars, and rumours of wars* ; 3. Famine ; 4. Pestilences ; and 5. Earthquakes, are successively enumerated ; but these were only (*ἀρχαὶ ὠδινῶν*) like the pangs of a woman in labour before her time is come, the preludes of national distress. He then passed on to the calamities that awaited themselves ; Persecution, the treachery of some of their own body, and the abounding of false teachers, the effect of which would be to cool the love of Christians both to Christ and to one another ; and he added, that notwithstanding opposition and apostasy, the Gospel would be first proclaimed throughout the world. The signal for their flight was to be the appear-

^k These signs were all fulfilled before the siege of Jerusalem. 1. Josephus gives us the history of Theudas, Ant. xx. 4. A.D. 48 ; and of an Egyptian, A.D. 58 ; Ant. xx. 7. for whom St. Paul was mistaken, Acts xxi. 38. The second is supplied by the local war between Herod the Tetrarch and his father-in-law, and the contest for the Empire on the death of Nero, the last of Cæsar's family. And rumours of a Parthian invasion were so prevalent, that the Governors of the Eastern Provinces made preparations to meet it. 3. The Famine throughout the land, foretold by Agabus, Acts xi. 28. lasted from A.D. 44, to A.D. 50. Josephus, Ant. xx. 4. 4. Tacitus records a Pestilence at Rome, A.D. 65, subsequent to St. Paul's martyrdom, in which, according to Suetonius, 30,000 persons perished. 5. Tacitus is also our authority for earthquakes, the most remarkable of which was severely felt in Asia Minor, where it nearly destroyed Colosse, Hierapolis, and Laodicea. He and Josephus agree in enumerating signs in the heavens, resembling, it should seem, comets and the Aurora Borealis, which, according to the latter, people interpreted as they liked, or set at nought, till they were convicted of infatuation by the capture of their country, and the destruction of themselves.

ance of the Roman Eagles within sight of the holy City, *the desolating Abomination*, as they are called by Daniel with the strictest propriety; for these standards, being objects of worship, were in Hebrew phraseology *abominations*; and none could be more desolating, for the Roman armies plundered and devastated without mercy, and, to use the indignant expression which one of their own historians puts into the mouth of a hostile chieftain¹, “where they have made a desert they call it peace.” This was fulfilled to the letter; for the Romans, on the capture of the town, brought the Eagles into the temple, and sacrificed to them; whereas before, the governors used to respect their scruples, and when they came up to Jerusalem, left them behind at Cæsarea^m. Our Lord proceeded to inform them, that there never had been, and never should be again, so great tribulation. He himself had shed tears upon the foresight of these scenes of horror; and the reader of Josephus, who will find in that historian a similar remark, will allow, that it is fully borne out by the event. Eleven hundred thousand persons are computed by him to have perished in the siege; and as it commenced at the Passover, a nation may be said to have been shut up within the walls; so that even allowing

¹ Speech of Galgacus in Tacitus's Life of Agricola, 30.

^m How strange and offensive a spectacle the approach of this *Abomination* must have been to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, will appear from the following incident: Pilate was the first governor that introduced these standards into the city; and he did it privately, the army making their entry in the night time. But as soon as the people knew it, they went in a vast body to Cæsarea, making earnest supplications that they might be removed. He surrounded them with his guards, and threatened them with immediate death if they did not return home; but they threw themselves on the ground, and offered their necks to the sword, saying, they could more easily die than act contrary to their laws. Upon which Pilate, surprised at their firmness, immediately complied with their request. Josephus, Ant. xviii. 4.

his numbers to be overstated, and considering how many must have died during the war, our Lord's expression is amply justified, that unless a limited season had been assigned, *no flesh should have been saved*, that is, the whole nation would have been exterminated; but those days were shortened as here promised, *for the sake of the elect*, or of those Jews that should hereafter be converted. St. Luke, who wrote more especially for Gentiles, adds the interesting fact, that Jerusalem should remain trodden down, that is, profanely occupied, by an unbelieving nation, until the time of the Gentiles were fulfilled; meaning, as it is understood by most, the completion of the period of 1260 years, announced by Daniel and St. John, which is to usher in the universal prevalence of genuine Christianity. This also has been accomplished: the town, with the exception of part of the wall, and three towers kept for a garrison, was demolished, and when restored by the Emperor *Ælius Hadrian*, with the name of *Ælia* in honour of himself, no Jew was permitted even to enter it. The Apostate Julian commanded in vain that the temple should be rebuilt; it is now the site of two mosques; and since the fall of the eastern empire, Jerusalem, except during eighty years after the first Crusade, has been under the government of Mahomedans.

Jesus then, from the fate of the antediluvians and of the Jews, exhorted them not to be taken by surprise, but to watch, and be ready for their Lord's more important coming as Judge of all men; and the ensuing parable of the faithful Steward, which, though a warning to all believers, is more especially addressed to the ministers of religion, has clearly no reference to the fall of Jerusalem, which has no connection with any subsequent reward. That subject, therefore, is altogether dismissed; and the prophecy passes on to the final judgment; but as it is not designed that the day or hour should be known, our Lord only told these confidential Apostles, that his coming will be

sudden and unexpected, and enjoined them, both by parables and in express words, to watch, and be ready in the discharge of their duties, that they might be able to *stand before the Son of Man*. Peter, fervid in his disposition, and full of affection to Jesus, broke out into this question, *Sayest thou these words unto us?* that is, dost thou exhort only us thy Apostles to vigilance, or does the caution concern all thy followers? The answer shows that it was designed for every generation, *What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch.* And certainly it concerns us as much as the believers of past ages, and equally whether we shall be found by him alive at his second advent on earth, or go unto him by death.

The same lesson is presented in another form in the parable of the prudent and foolish Virgins. Even the former had fallen asleep, for the best have sins of infirmity and omission; but when aroused by the midnight cry, they had only to trim their lamps, for their oil or stock of grace, though not in use as it ought to have been, was not exhausted. The foolish ones had, when it was wanted, no oil, that is, no fruits of faith, consequently no genuine faith. They discovered their deficiency, but too late; and while they went, according to the advice of their wiser associates, in search of oil, the others had entered with the bridegroom, the palace door was fastened, and they were shut out for ever. We learn from the answer of the prudent ones, that the best of Christians have no superfluous works of merit, the benefits of which can be made over to othersⁿ.

Sudden unexpected arrival after long delay is implied in

ⁿ “Voluntary works besides, over and above God’s commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required.” XIVth Article of our Church.

both parables, and still more plainly in that of the Talents, which a master delivered to his servants to trade with, in which it is positively stated, that he had travelled into a far country, and did not return to reckon with them, till after a long time. St. Luke records instead of this a parable of Pounds, the moral of which is the same; but to save the justice of the owner it is stated in each, that the pounds and talents were intrusted to every man, according to his ability. *Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord*, is equivalent to, Sit down at the banquet prepared in honour of my return, which may be considered as in itself an act of emancipation. The virgins were waiting, these servants were working, for their Lord.

119. Description of the day of Judgment. Matt. xxv. 31—46.

Our Lord, having made this gradual transition from the destruction of the Jewish city and polity to his personal coming to judgment on his people, proceeded to describe, with the authority of a Judge, the awful day of final retribution, when the good and bad of all nations, summoned to *his glorious throne* to give an *account of the things done in the body*, are described under the figure of sheep and goats, placed on his right hand and his left. One quality only is selected to determine their acceptance or rejection, Love, as shown in active benevolence to Christ in the poor. This sentence of St. Jerome, “*Christo in Pauperibus*,” is inscribed over the Hospital at Berne; and it ought to be familiar to members of our own communion, as the author of the instructive Homily against Perils of Idolatry, and superfluous decking of Churches, closes the third part with an exhortation, instead of wasting our substance upon dead stocks and stones, “to bestow it according to God’s word mercifully upon poor men and women, fatherless children, widows, sick persons, *strangers*, prisoners, and such others as be in any necessity.” The former are invited into ever-

lasting happiness, the latter are sent into everlasting misery; but there is a remarkable variation in the language; *the kingdom* is said to be *prepared for the righteous from the foundation of the world*; but Hell, though it will be the habitation of the unmerciful, who are here called, *ye cursed*, is said to have been prepared, not for them, but *for the Devil and his angels*. “It is important to remark, that the selfishness which will place men at the left hand of the Judge is not positive but negative; they are punished not for oppressing, but merely for neglecting, the poor. Had not the Judge himself described it, we might have supposed that this fearful position would be occupied only by the outcasts of humanity, monsters of rapacity, avarice, and injustice. But no. The fig-tree was withered not for bearing bad fruit, but for yielding none. The foolish virgins were excluded from the marriage feast not for casting away their lamps, but not using them. The unprofitable servant was cast into outer darkness not for wasting the talent committed to him, but for not employing it. The worldling, whom our Lord denominated a fool, is not charged with any positive sins; for aught that appears he had been honest and industrious; his diligence had been crowned with success, and he proposed to enjoy that success in retirement and ease—and what is this but an every-day history? But he had laid up treasure for himself, and was not rich towards God. And they who do not now learn the moral of his history—to take heed and beware of covetousness—are here represented as finally sharing his doom. They may have been free from all the grosser vices, they may have had many negative virtues, and have boasted that they did no harm. But the ground of their condemnation will be that they did no good. They were not extortioners, oppressors, cruel, they were only not kind. The condemnation of such includes of course all actual transgressors.”

We must not, however, hence hastily conclude, that charity will purchase, as it were, heaven, and make amends for sin and the omission of other duties, but must take it as described by the Apostle, as not only relieving the distressed, but as abstaining against whatever may injure our neighbour, and so being *the fulfilling of the Law*. I observed in previous editions, that one distinguishing and conspicuous virtue is brought forward to illustrate the Christian character, which cannot exist alone, and which springs from a saving *faith* in the Redeemer, *working by love*; for we must observe, that the quality selected is not general, but Christian benevolence; love to the brethren, for the sake of their common Master; *Inasmuch as you did it* (not merely to your fellow creatures out of pity, but) *to the least of these my brethren*, for my sake, *you did it unto me*. We here perceive the Judge not only noticing the works of his people when they make no mention of them, but when he is pleased to recount them with satisfaction, they seem to have forgotten that they ever performed them; and clearly do not build upon them their hope of salvation. But the self-righteous, we learn from his words in another place, will plead their merits and usefulness: *Lord, have we not prophesied* (that is, taught) *in thy Name, and in thy Name done many miracles?* Such is the ordinary interpretation, on the supposition that the words were spoken to Christians; yet some modern commentators infer, as the sheep and the goat are called *nations*, ἔθνη, they were still *heathen*, whom the Gospel message had never reached, and that the case of Christians had been considered under the preceding parables. Upon this view, the difficulty arising from the omission of faith as a condition of acceptance is altogether removed, the Lord being considered not as the Saviour but as God; and the heathen are judged according to the natural law, and the precept most legibly *written on their hearts*. Thus a transition is made first from the Jew to the Christian, and finally to the rest of mankind.

120. *Jesus foretels that he shall be delivered up to be crucified. Matt. xxvi. 1—6.*

Jesus then informed his disciples, that at the ensuing Passover he should be delivered up in order to be crucified, for he had all along a foreknowledge of his sufferings, peculiar to himself. Futurity was concealed even from his most favoured servants and martyrs, as appears from the words of St. Paul, *I go up to Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there^p*; but Jesus had ever before his eyes the ignominious and painful death which was to close his ministry; and this knowledge, while it vindicates him from the imputation of being an impostor, and exalts his character as a man, is also evidence to his divine nature. At the same time he ever looked forward with calm confidence to its object and its consequences. His allusions to it are often connected with the glory that was to follow, and show the workings of a mind thoroughly conscious of being appointed to accomplish infinite good through great personal calamity. His voluntary relinquishment of earthly power, which Mahomet sought and obtained, and his declaration that an ignominious death was a necessary preliminary to his success, which, though designed to be universal, would be slow and distant, are inexplicable upon any other theory than the orthodox faith. We are all ready to admit, that *to him bear all the Prophets witness*; but we are apt to forget, that in the variety and clearness of his own predictions, he excelled them all. He foretold not only the fall of Jerusalem, but what should happen to himself and his followers, and the ultimate triumph of the truth, notwithstanding his rejection by his own nation; and is himself alike the subject and author of prophecy.

^p Acts xx. 22.

PART VI.

121. *The Apostles prepare the Passover.* Matt. xxvi. 17.
Mark xiv. 13—16. Luke xxii. 7, 8.

THE resort of strangers to Jerusalem at the national festivals, may be fairly supposed to have at least doubled for a time the number of inhabitants; for Cestius Gallus, Governor of Syria, being curious to ascertain how many persons were present at the Passover which he attended, A.D. 65, the number of lambs was reckoned, which, allowing one for ten persons, gave a temporary population of 2,556,000. This like the other enumerations of Josephus is suspicious; yet the Pilgrimages to Mecca show, that religion can bring together to one spot an enormous multitude, even from more distant regions. It was customary for householders to allow these strangers the gratuitous use of rooms on such occasions^a. From the Mount of Olives Jesus now returned for the last time to Bethany. The next morning was probably devoted to solitary meditation and prayer, for it does not appear that he visited Jerusalem at an early hour. He then directed Peter and John not at once to the house which he meant to use, but to a place where they would meet a servant of the owner, who, we presume, was one of his followers. It is supposed that this circuitous manner was chosen, that his enemies might be ignorant of the spot, and so allow him time to institute the Commemoration of his death, and to take leave of the Apostles. This supper is perplexed with critical difficulties. The curious on the subject will find an accurate statement

^a Κατάλυμα, here translated *Guest-chamber*, is the same word that is rendered *Inn* in the account of the Nativity, and is there supposed to answer to the modern term *Caravansary*, meaning a place provided for travellers, without any charge for the use of the apartments.

of the discordant opinions in an elaborate note in Townsend's Chronological Arrangement of the Bible. It is evident that it took place on the Thursday, on the night of which Jesus was seized: and yet St. John informs us, that on the following morning the Jews would not enter the Governor's palace, lest they should contract such a defilement as would prevent their eating the Passover; and that our Lord expired at the very time appointed for feeding upon that eminent type of the Saviour, the Paschal lamb. Some distinguished Roman Catholic divines, as Toinard, Calmet, Lamy, and Dupin, maintain, in consequence, that Jesus did not keep the Passover, but only partook of a farewell supper. His words, however, in instituting the Sacrament, imply, that the Paschal supper had preceded it; and the contrary opinion is hardly reconcileable with his command, *Go and prepare us the Passover;* and with his speech at the feast, *With desire I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you.* I therefore, with Grotius, Hammond, Mac-knight, and other commentators, believe, that our Lord anticipated the feast by a day. This I conceive St. John, with his usual accuracy, intended to state; and as he wrote with a knowledge of the earlier Gospels, and with the design of supplying their omissions, I consider his testimony as decisive. As our Paschal victim was sacrificed for us, it became Christ to suffer at the hour when the Lamb was eaten. Greswell is probably right in supposing, that the message he sent, recorded by Matthew, *My time is at hand,* was designed to remove any surprise at his celebrating the Passover on an unusual day. It may be objected, that as the animals were not to be killed in a private dwelling, but *in the place in which the Lord should choose to put his name,* that is, in the temple of Jerusalem, Jesus could only keep the Passover in the imperfect manner of the modern Jews, with bitter herbs, and unleavened cakes, omitting the lamb. But Philo, our Lord's contemporary, informs us, that in

this instance alone, every Israelite was permitted to act as a priest, and kill his own victim; and though Jesus did not conform to the practice of the Pharisees, and of the majority of the nation, still he was not singular, but followed the calculation of the Sadducees, which several distinguished chronologists maintain to be correct.

The Passover had been instituted by Divine command, the night before the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, for a memorial of their signal deliverance out of their *house of bondage*, and of the mercy of God in *passing over* their houses, and sparing them when he *passed through the land of Egypt*, and slew all the firstborn, both man and beast. It was natural that such a night, when grief was so marvellously succeeded by joy, and slavery was suddenly exchanged for liberty, should be observed by them in all generations; and Moses expressly ordered that it should be kept a *Feast by an ordinance for ever*, and made it open the ecclesiastical year. It was called also the Feast of unleavened bread, because that was the only kind to be used during the seven days of its continuance, and it was to be kept by all Israelites and proselytes, but no uncircumcised person was permitted to partake of it. The animal on which they were to feast might be either a lamb or a kid, but the former was preferred. It must be *without blemish, a male of the first year*: to be selected out of the flock four days before; and was (after the erection of the Temple) to be slain in one of its courts, between the two evenings, that is, three and five o'clock in the afternoon. It was to be roasted whole, *not a bone of it was to be broken*, and none of it was to be left till morning, so that two families joined together to eat it, when one was too small. In the time of Josephus, a Paschal society consisted of not less than ten, nor more than twenty individuals. They reclined round a table, that it might be known, as one of their Rabbis observes, that they had passed from bondage into liberty; for the in-

junction, *Ye shall eat it in haste, with your loins girded, and shoes on your feet* ready to depart, was given up upon their settlement in Canaan. This may teach us not to overrate the importance of the posture in which we communicate, which has unhappily long divided Christians, since our Lord set his Apostles an example of conforming to established custom, by reclining at the Paschal supper. The feast having been commanded, it seems that the Israelites were allowed to regulate as they pleased the details; and so it appears that Christ having appointed a supper of bread and wine in commemoration of his death, has left the mode of distributing and of partaking of it to be regulated at the discretion of the authorities in his Church. The modern Jews being in their dispersion, as foretold by Hosea^b, without a sacrifice, omit the essential part of the feast, as I have observed, yet they minutely record the manner in which it is said to have been celebrated by their ancestors; and the following account from the writings of their Rabbis is inserted, as explanatory of its connection with the Christian Passover, which was designed to supersede it. The ceremony began with a cup of wine diluted with water, according to the usage of antiquity, preceded by a grace. The party then washed their hands, and the supper was placed upon the table. It consisted of the peace offerings of the day before, the Lamb, two unleavened cakes, a salad of bitter herbs, and a thick sauce of dates, figs, and raisins mixed together with vinegar. This was not prescribed in the Law, but was subsequently introduced to remind them, it is said, of the clay of Egypt. The Master of the feast next ate a small quantity of the salad dipped in this sauce, and his example was followed by the rest. The supper was then removed, that the meaning of the ordinance might be explained; and this was followed by singing the hundred and thirteenth and the hundred and fourteenth Psalms,

^b Hosea iii. 4.

called the Egyptian Hallel, or thanksgiving, during which, a second cup of wine was drunk. The hands being again washed, the Master blessed and broke one of the unleavened cakes, (the bread it was called of poverty and affliction,) reserving half a one to eat with the last morsel of the lamb. A piece of this he took with the bitter herbs, and dipped it in the sauce: the family followed his example; and this appears to be what in our version is rendered *the sop*. The peace offerings were eaten next; and lastly, the lamb, after which the company again washed their hands, and gave thanks. This was followed by two cups, that of Blessing, equivalent to our grace cup, and that denominated *Hallel*, because they sung over it the remaining Psalms of praise, from the hundred and fifteenth to the hundred and eighteenth inclusive. Another blessing closed the entertainment. Commentators do not agree in the precise time at which our Lord instituted the Eucharist, because the Evangelists do not all record the same particulars, nor those they do, in the same order. In Luke's account we read of another cup^c previous to the Sacramental one, which, according to Lightfoot, who was deeply versed in Hebrew literature, was either the third or fourth of the Passover. Others keep our Feast distinct from the Jewish, taking *after supper* literally, and supposing that the cup to be drunk in memory of Christ's precious blood-shedding was a *fifth*; and this is countenanced by the words with which our Lord accompanied it, *drink ye all of this*; for the Paschal cups they would take of course, this they might otherwise have declined. Upon the settlement of this point depends the question of Judas's partaking of the Eucharist. It is the general opinion of the Fathers that he did; and it is assumed in our Communion Service; but many think that our Lord, who *knew what was in man*, would not admit into this covenant one who was about to break it in so awful a

^c Luke xxii. 17.

manner; and the Scripture seems to confirm their opinion, for, according to St. John, Judas went out after receiving the sop, which was evidently a part of the Paschal supper. Certainly in the first two Gospels, the declaration, *he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same will betray me*, precedes the institution of the Sacrament, and we may suppose (though it is not there mentioned) that Judas then immediately went out, as we learn from St. John. In the third the remark follows, but it seems placed out of the natural order.

St. Paul declares the mystical signification of the Jewish ordinance^d, when he calls Christ *our Passover*; the Baptist referred to this type still more than to the daily sacrifice, when he pointed him out as *the Lamb of God*; and on this account St. Peter^e calls him *a Lamb without blemish and without spot*; and the beloved disciple, *the Lamb that was slain*^f. The benefits derived from his death are visibly prefigured in the Passover. The Israelites were preserved from the destroying Angel by the blood of the Lamb sprinkled upon their door-posts, and, upon eating their first passover, were delivered from the house of bondage. Thus only can sinners escape the wrath of a just and holy God, by taking refuge at the foot of the cross, and pleading the *sprinkling of the blood* of him, of whom the Paschal lamb was the type^g; and through whose death alone believers are freed from the service of sin, and brought *into the glorious liberty of the children of God*^h, to celebrate not a national, but an universal, not a temporal, but a spiritual, deliverance. We have no difficulty in understanding, that the eating of the lamb means our feeding in faith upon the Saviour, because he himself employed this metaphorical language in his discourse in the synagogue of Capernaum. None of the lamb was to be left; and this

^d 1 Cor. v. 7.

^e 1 Pet. i. 19.

^f Rev. v. 9.

^g Heb. xii. 24.

^h Heb. ix. 12. Rom. viii. 21.

may signify that we are not to rely in part upon what he has done for us, and in part upon ourselves, but that we must ascribe to him our whole salvation, and acknowledge him in all his offices; that is, not only take him as our Teacher and our Guide, or as our Priest and our Sacrifice, but also obey him as our Sovereign. The bitter herbs are said to denote repentance, and our willingness, if necessary, to take up our cross and follow him; and to those who treat such interpretation as fanciful, we may answer, that they seem to be borne out by the example of St. Paulⁱ, who explains the unleavened bread as a type of sincerity and truth, in contradistinction to malice and wickedness, qualities that must accompany faith in Christ, if we hope that he will prove our Passover, that is, our protector from the wrath of God, and our redeemer from the worst thraldom, that of the soul. As none who were legally impure might eat the Paschal supper, it behoves Christians to cleanse themselves from all iniquity, and to be pure in their desires as well as in their conduct, when they assemble to partake of the pledges of a Saviour's love. We must consider, as we are reminded in the Service, how "St. Paul exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup;" which, it should be observed, he still calls Bread and Wine, while he speaks of not discerning the Lord's Body.

ⁱ 1 Cor. v. 7.

122. *Supper being ready, the Apostles having again contended for preeminence, their Master washes their feet as an example of humility.* Matt. xxvi. 20. Luke xxii. 15—27. John xiii. 1—17.

Our Saviour's Paschal supper was now *ready*^k, but it was suspended by an unseasonable discussion among the apostles concerning preeminence. He had already condemned this spirit of ambition by words, and by the example of a child: he now for the last time endeavoured to suppress it by a most affecting act, expressive of his own humility. He laid aside his cloak, girded himself with a napkin, and washed their feet, a customary ceremony^l in the East in that age previous to eating, but performed, when done by others, by inferiors; thus significantly showing that he had been among them *as he that serveth*. If he then, whose superiority they allowed, and whom they emphatically and justly styled *the Teacher* and *the Master*, had condescended to perform to them this menial service, they ought readily, as he told them, in imitation of him, to undertake the meanest and most laborious offices for their fellow-servants. Even as thus put, his condescension is wonderful; but how greatly is it heightened, when we consider his superhuman dignity! The Evangelist who recorded it after a long lapse of years, must have deeply felt it; for, contrary to his usual habit, he introduces it by allusions both to his acquired and his original glory; *Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hand, and that he was come from God and went to God.* Peter, with his usual ardour, twice refused to suffer his Master to perform an office which he regarded as too degrading; but when told, that unless he submitted he would have *no part with him*, the same ardour made him

^k Γενομένου, come, not ended, as in our translation. John xxi. 4.

^l Luke vii. 36. *If she have washed the saints' feet.* 1 Tim. v. 10. *Let me be a servant to wash the feet of my Lord.* 1 Sam. xxv. 41.

exclaim, *Not my feet only, but also my hands and my head*^m. Our Lord's reply shows, that he had designed in this act to convey a deeper spiritual meaning, and availed himself of this external washing, to advert to internal purity. His words are, *he that has bathed needs only to wash his feet, but is perfectly clean*. He seems to speak of those who are born of God, and whose corrupt nature has been renewed by divine grace, but who, though sin reigns in these no longer, are still liable to outbreaks of original corruption, and need that these infirmities should be washed awayⁿ. *Ye are clean*, he continued, *but not all*. Hence we learn, that the feet of Judas were washed as well as those of the rest, and that Jesus warned him that he knew what was in his heart.

The custom, which was not designed for servile imitation, was never introduced into the West; and in the East, a change of dress has long since abolished it; still under all the variations that time produces, the spirit of the precept may be observed; for we shall never be at a loss for ways of relieving and comforting our Christian brethren in a condescending and self-denying manner. The Friends argue from its temporary nature, that the Lord's Supper was not designed to be a permanent institution: but the text does not warrant the conclusion, and we know of no church or sect that has retained or revived the custom as a religious rite; though a representation of it was introduced in the fourth century, and is still kept up by the Pope and some Roman Catholic Sovereigns. This formal washing of poor men's feet on the anniversary of the day when our Lord kept the Passover, is not however, even by themselves, regarded as more than an act of Christian humility.

^m The distinction is strongly marked in the original, in which we have for washing two verbs, λούω and νίπτω, the first meaning a complete, the latter a partial, ablution.

ⁿ Bishop Hall's Contemplations.

123. *Jesus foretels that one of the twelve shall betray him; and, on Judas's leaving the room, declares that now he is glorified.* Matt. xxvi. 22—24. Luke xxii. 28—31. John xiii. 18—23.

Jesus having resumed his place, and explained this lesson of humility, informed the Apostles, that as they had remained with him during his trials, his Father having assigned unto him *a kingdom*, he assigned to them the privilege of eating and drinking at his table *in that kingdom*, and granted them the office of judging the twelve tribes of Israel; one excepted, whom he denounced as a traitor, expressing his ingratitudo in the figurative language of David, meant primarily concerning Ahithophel, to intimate that his treachery had been foretold. John, who reclined next below his Master, tells us, that he was troubled when he said that one of the twelve would deliver him up; and it must doubtless have heightened this extreme affliction, that the event was brought about through the agency of a confidential friend. Each anxiously inquired if he were the person; and John, at Peter's suggestion, asked Jesus, leaning over that he might not be overheard. To him he answered, probably in an under voice, that it was the one to whom he was about to give the sop; and from this it appears that Judas must have been nearer to his Master than most of them. At length that disciple himself inquired if he were the person, fearing perhaps that if he alone were silent, suspicion of him would be excited; and Jesus answered, *Thou hast said it.* But this could not have been heard by the rest; for our Lord's next address to him, *What thou doest, do quickly*, while it intimated to him, that his purpose was understood, was expressed in language unintelligible to the eleven, who differed as to its meaning. Judas, instigated perhaps by anger at his detection, or fearing discovery, retired almost immediately to make his arrangement with

the priests. Satan is said to have entered into his heart; but he had no power to compel him against his will, which was free to follow its own choice. Before he left the room, his Lord gave him the awful warning, *Woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born!* and if he had suffered the warning to have had its proper effect, he would have relinquished his guilty design. The scriptural prediction did not interfere with his free agency: his Master even warned him of the consequences; but Satan tempted him by covetousness, or it might have been by ambition, and he chose to yield to his instigation. The sum for which he agreed is so small, that it is difficult to conceive that it could be an adequate temptation; possibly he hoped, by ingratiating himself with the priests, to obtain future advantages beyond the stipulated remuneration, as some modern writers suggest; or, believing Jesus to be the Messiah, he might wish to force him to assume his sovereignty, thinking that he might then be forgiven, and procure the wealth he coveted. Whatever were his motives, he seems not to have anticipated his Master's condemnation to death.

His departure was, as it were, the commencement of the sufferings of our Lord; who now addressed to his chosen confidential friends a parting discourse, by which he intended to infix in their minds truths, which, ignorant as they were, and overcome with affliction, they could not fully comprehend, yet might derive from them the hope of future consolation. These dying words were followed by a prayer, in which he recommended to his heavenly Father himself these his Apostles, and all future believers. To St. John we are indebted for the preservation of both; and no part of his Gospel, or indeed of the inspired volume, is more interesting, and more capable of *building us up in our most holy faith.*

The discourse is primarily and specially addressed to the

eleven, and the promise that they should perform greater works than himself, is made to them as the future propagators of his religion; still, in a great degree, it concerns the believers of every age, for on all of them is bestowed in a measure the gift of God's Holy Spirit, and mutual love is the duty, and ought to be the characteristic, as much of the meanest Christians, as of the Apostles themselves. These are Christ's last words; yet not his own approaching suffering, but their sorrow, occupies his mind. He does not mention by name his death, or his cross; but the first he calls his departure to his Father; the second, his glorification. It was St. John's peculiar object to prove that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of God, from his actions and discourses; and in no discourse are they more plainly revealed than in this final one, in which he asserted what no mere man could justly assert, *he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; he that loveth me, shall be loved by my Father;* and, *If I depart, I will send the Comforter unto you, and he will glorify me.* This discourse and prayer may be regarded as the strongholds of orthodoxy with respect to those essential tenets; and yet, strange as it may seem, the Anti-Trinitarians press even them into their service, because they contain two passages, which detached from the context would appear to favour their system; *My Father is greater than I:* and, *This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* As the attributes of Divinity are claimed by our Lord throughout the discourse and prayer, these two passages cannot really contradict the scope of the whole; an orthodox explanation must be sought, and it is immediately found in the contrast between our Lord's temporary abasement, when *he humbled himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and the glory which he had with the Father before the world was.* An earthly monarch is greater than his ambassador, but it is in office, not in nature; because both are men, and throughout

this Gospel, Jesus speaks of himself as a Legate, teaching and acting according to his Father's instructions. Such is, I apprehend, the true meaning of the text, but it was often quoted by the Ante-Nicene Fathers in proof of the subordination in nature of the second Person in the Trinity to the first, which is implied in the terms *paternity* and *filiation*. The Father they called Αὐτόθεος, God in himself—the source of Deity; the Son, Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, God of God,—rather God out of God; a term which they introduced into the Creed, and which Bishop Bull, in his elaborate Defence of the Ante-Nicene Faith, has shown to be compatible with the essential equality of the two. The other declaration, The Father is the only true God, is not to be so strictly taken as to exclude the Son, since St. John in his first epistle^o gives the same appellation to the Son; and the Father is called *the only Potentate, who only hath immortality*^p, in the same epistle of St. Paul in which the Son is declared to be *God manifest in the flesh*^q. So far indeed were the early Christians from adopting the Unitarian interpretation, that their tendency was to the contrary extreme; and the first heretics, the Gnostics, went so far as to deny that our Saviour had a real human body. This tenet of Christ's simple humanity has never been professed by any large denomination of Christians, nor is it surprising, for it annihilates the essence of his religion; a few detached texts like these being all that can be brought forward in its support, while the scheme of his divinity pervades the gospels as well as the epistles.

The same critics who refuse to acknowledge an Almighty Saviour, would also deprive us of the Comforter, whom he promised to supply his place. While they reject the divinity of the second Person in the Trinity, they deny even the existence of the third, whom they confound either with his own gifts, or with the Father. This attempt is certainly easier than the former, because in some passages

^o 1 John v. 20.

^p 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.

^q 1 Tim. iii. 16.

the Giver is really put for the Gift; and as the Holy Spirit never became incarnate, there are not so many texts respecting him as the Son. Still this discourse alone is sufficient to satisfy an unprejudiced enquirer, that the Comforter, whom Christ declared he would send from the Father to dwell with believers, is distinct from them both. Though Πνεῦμα, Spirit, be a neuter noun, it is here followed with the masculine pronoun, and the offices of feeling, teaching, and reproving are personal; while the person who teaches the future, and calls the past to remembrance, cannot but be Divine, and yet cannot be the same as he from whom he proceeds, and from whom he is distinguished in the forms both of baptism and of benediction. The miraculous gifts ascribed to the Spirit by St. Paul also imply his Divinity, and he is not an unconscious channel through which they flow, but *he divideth them severally* to the various members of the Church *as He will*. The Nicene Creed ended with a bare acknowledgment of the Holy Ghost, but we repeat it as enlarged at the Council of Constantinople, with the declaration that he is both "the Lord, and the Giver of life," and "proceedeth from the Father." The addition, "and from the Son," is first found in the early Gallican Liturgy; and we may regret the papal adoption of it, since its unauthorized introduction into the Creed affords the Greek Church a plausible objection. The truth, however, of the proposition is manifest to a reader of the Scriptures; for in the very verse that declares the Procession of the Spirit from the Father, the Son says, *I will send him*, and there is, throughout the whole economy of Grace, among the Three, an identity not only of will, but also of agency and of nature.

The Holy Spirit is called Παράκλητος, Paraclete, a term, like Λόγος, Logos, peculiar to St. John. It is difficult to find for either an adequate translation. *Comforter*, taken from the Vulgate, is suitable in many respects,

especially in this consolatory discourse; but even here it is also said, that he is *to teach and to guide them into all the truth*, and therefore Monitor is preferred by some translators. Both, however, are too narrow to express the whole compass of gifts which this divine substitute of our Lord bestows; and therefore as the idea to be conveyed is that of one who is to assist and plead their cause, the meaning is, I think, best represented by Advocate, as opposed to Accuser. That term too will suit our Lord; for we must recollect, that we must find one applicable to both, as, with reference to himself, he called the Holy Ghost another Paraclete; and it is applied to him by St. John in his first epistle, *If we sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.* As the Son and the Spirit are called by the same title, the same office of Intercession is ascribed to both. In the epistle to the Hebrews it is written, *The Son ever liveth to make intercession for us*^r; and in that to the Romans, *the Spirit maketh intercession for us*^s. But they are Advocates in different courts; the Son pleads his own merits in his Father's presence, and thereby propitiates him, and renders him gracious to us. The Spirit has for his province the human heart, and pleads with men, convincing them of sin, and constraining them by the terrors of the Law, and the mercy of the Gospel, to lay aside their enmity to God; and having brought them to acknowledge their want both of Jesus as a Saviour, and their need of his holy influence, as to seek the Father on *his throne of grace*. Having excited in such the desire to pray, he *helpeth their infirmities* by interceding for them, *with groanings that cannot be uttered*^t; and these earnest longings after spiritual blessings, which they know not how to express, are understood and approved by God, *who searcheth the heart, and looketh not*

^r Heb. vii. 25.

^s Rom. viii. 26.

^t Rom. viii. 26.

to the language or manner, but to the matter, of their petitions.

Jesus first spoke of his death, and gave them to understand that it was approaching, but spoke of it in enigmatical language, saying, *Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him*; for, however ignominious it might appear, it would eminently display both his own glory, and his Father's; and this it did by explaining the real character of each, as well as by his Resurrection and Ascension. He affectionately took leave of them as *dear children*, and enjoined them to show their attachment, not by ineffectual sorrow, but by obeying his new commandment of mutual love. He had shown on a former occasion, that the Law required them to *love their neighbour as themselves*, including under that term all mankind. He could not therefore mean, by *a new commandment*, philanthropy; though this is maintained by almost all the commentators, who suppose that new is used as equivalent to excellent; or that the expression is justified, because the duty is enforced by new motives. But the virtue he recommended is, I conceive, love of the brotherhood, and that not the brotherhood we inherit from Adam, but that which we derive from Christ; a virtue which had never been heard of before. From the beginning the Moral Law bound men to love one another, as partakers of the same common nature, but the Evangelical bindeth believers to love all Christians, as partakers of the same common faith in Christ^a. *A new commandment I give unto you, Love—not your neighbour, but—one another. By this, he added, shall all men know that ye are my disciples:* and we find, long after, that it was a common remark among their enemies, “See how these Christians love one another.” We must feel a love

^a Saunderson's Sermon ad Aulam, on *Honour all men, Love the brotherhood.*

of good will to all men; to the wicked, and even to our enemies; but our special regard is to be reserved for the genuine followers of our Redeemer, who are *not strangers and foreigners*, but *fellow-citizens*, heirs of the same inheritance, and members of the same body; and this special love will be in proportion both to the degree in which our brethren are renewed after the image of their Creator, and to our love of him who begat them. *Let us do good unto all men, but specially to the household of faith*, is the injunction of one Apostle^x. *Every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten*, is the declaration of another, who is supposed to have possessed in a higher degree than the rest this attractive characteristic of our faith, and shows himself most anxious to inculcate it. In countries where all *profess* Christianity, the two virtues are apt to be confounded; but St. Peter carefully marks the distinction, *add to brotherly kindness, charity*^y, that is, *love*; and, *above all things have fervent charity among yourselves*^a: while St. John makes the Christian's assurance of salvation depend upon the performance of this duty. *We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren*^b. Charity, that is philanthropy, and brotherly love, proceed from different principles; *compassion* is the source of the former, *approbation* of the latter. It may be also called new, on account of the degree in which it was to be practised; for Christ afterwards said, *This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you*; a love which showed itself by all self-denying services, even at last unto the surrender of life.

^x Gal. vi. 10.

^y 1 John v. 1.

* 2 Pet. i. 7.

^a 1 Pet. iv. 8.

^b 1 John iii. 14.

124. *He foretels the fall and recovery of Peter.* Matt. xxvi.

31—33. *Mark xiv. 30, 31. Luke xxii. 31—38. John xiii.*

36—38.

The declaration, *Whither I go, as I said unto the Jews, I say unto you, ye cannot come*, had distressed them all; and Peter, with his usual eagerness, thinking not of his Master's death, but of his departure to some other country, interrupted him with the question, *Whither goest thou?* Jesus in reply thus explained the former, saying, *Thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me hereafter*; showing that what was denied altogether to the Jews, was to believers only postponed. Peter could not follow then, because the work assigned to him was not accomplished, nor had he yet the courage of a martyr. Jesus then declared that they would all be overcome with temptation that night, and *be scattered abroad*, when, as Zechariah^c had predicted, God should *smite the Shepherd*; but that after he had risen from the dead, he would go before them into Galilee. Peter, confident in his own strength, persisted in maintaining, that whatever others might do, he would never desert him, but would lay down his life for his sake. Our Lord replied, that Satan had sought to sift them all; but that he had prayed for him in particular, that his faith might not fail, (that is, not finally, like that of Judas, for it was overcome for a season,) and admonished him, when restored, to strengthen his brethren. He assured him, when he declared his readiness to follow him to prison or to death, that he knew himself so little, that, to avoid even the possibility of danger, he would that very night thrice deny him. Peter only renewed his asseveration; and this self-confidence, which does not seem to have been shaken even by the prediction, was the first step to his fall. Jesus then reminded them all, that when he had sent them out

^c Zech. xiii. 7.

before, they had not been allowed to make any provision for their journey, yet had every where found an hospitable reception. Now, on the contrary, they must look forward to hardships, and even to persecution ; they must take whatever they had, purse and bag, for few would be disposed to assist them, and a sword for their protection would seem even more necessary than a cloak. Upon this they showed him two swords which they happened to have, (arms being probably then carried by travellers for their security.) He replied, *It is enough*; and the reply is considered by some as justifying self-defence against robbers and other violators of the law, though not in opposition to the civil authority. Two swords were not enough for the approaching attack, if he had meditated resistance; and this we know, from his reproof to Peter for using one of them, was not his intention. His meaning was not taken, and he did not deem it necessary to enter into any explanation. The language also is ambiguous ; the best explanation seems to be, that it is a common Hebrew mode of stopping the unseasonable remarks of another, and that he intended by it to close the conversation, as they had misconceived him, and the event would soon correct their mistake.

125. *He institutes the Sacrament of the Commemoration of his Death.* Matt. xxvi. 26—29. Mark xiv. 22—25. Luke xxii. 19, 20.

The Paschal supper being finished, the Lord instituted his own ; and the name reminds us both of the person who ordained it, and of the hour when it was originally celebrated. According to Hales, Jesus substituted his Supper for the third course of the Passover, but as it was not to be connected with, but to supersede, that Feast, I prefer the opinion, that it was independent of it, and followed. This opinion seems to be confirmed by the remark, that as it was his habit before any meal of thanking the gracious Giver of

food, so the Evangelist designed to mark this as another supper, by writing, that *as they were eating Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and he took the cup, and gave thanks.* It seems, that he did not partake of either. It is a reasonable supposition, that the cup was given immediately after the bread as at the Passover, although Newcome, as I conceive, by a misconception of Luke's narrative, inserts between these too indispensable parts of this Sacrament, a portion of our Lord's last discourse.

The Eucharist is so solemn an act of worship, and its intent has been so perverted by the Church, from which our Reformers held it to be their duty, on that account as well as on many others, to withdraw, that it requires in a work explanatory of the Gospels a fuller consideration than most of the Articles of our Faith. I shall state, therefore, as briefly as I can, from the Formularies of the Church of England, and from the expositions of some of her most approved Divines, as the Archbishops Tillotson and Sharp, and Dr. Waterland, the nature and meaning of the Lord's Supper^e, the correctness of which is established by its accordance with the Word of God. It has received the name of *Sacrament*, as is generally supposed, from the Latin word for the military oath, which bound the Roman soldiers, because it pledges the participant to allegiance and obedience to his Master, *who has bought him with a price, whose he is*, and whom he ought to serve: but it has been suggested to me by a friend, that it may be of ecclesiastical origin, as the translation of *Mυστήγιον*, which our version renders *Mystery*, but the Vulgate

^e A chain of citations from the Fathers and Schoolmen, to a very few alone of whom the limits assigned to this work have permitted me to refer, may be found in Abp. Usher's Challenge to a Jesuit, Bp. Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, Abp. Tillotson's Discourse against Transubstantiation, and Dr. Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist.

Sacramentum. It is called the *Eucharist*, because it represents the event which above all demands thanksgiving: and the *Communion*, because, as St. Paul^f expresses himself, we are therein *partakers of the same loaf*: and are so reminded, that all Christians, whatever may be their external differences, should regard themselves as members of one family, of which Christ is the Head. It is a melancholy reflection, that what was instituted as a bond of union, has become a main cause of division, and has separated not only Protestants from Romanists, but from one another; as the Lutheran Church from the Reformed abroad, and Episcopilians from Presbyterians at home. Our Lord's appointment of this solemn Commemoration of his Death, is in itself a strong presumption that he was the Messiah; for what impostor or enthusiast would wish to perpetuate the memory of the ignominious termination of his life by the decree of the magistrate? It is, however, more than this, for why should not his followers rather commemorate his miraculous Birth, triumphant Resurrection, or glorious Ascension? And the mode of commemoration is still more extraordinary, for it is not by a fast, but by a feast; not with mourning, but with joy and thankfulness. Deny the Atonement and its consequences, and this manner of *showing forth the Lord's death* is inexplicable; admit it, and it is natural, and in the highest degree significant^g.

The institution of this Sacrament has been described by the first three Evangelists; and we infer from the silence of the fourth, that they had transmitted all necessary information. We have another account of it in the first Epistle to the Corinthians^h, which St. Paul received immediately from Christ; and this special revelation proves both the importance and the perpetuity of the ordinance. His words,

^f 1 Cor. x. 17.

^g Scott's Commentary on Matthew xxvi. 25.

^h Chap. xi.

as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come, demonstrate that this Sacrament was designed not for the Apostles only, but for believers in every age; and, accordingly, with the solitary exception of the “Friends,” all denominations of Christians, though some exalt it too high, and others degrade it too low, agree in retaining it as an indispensable part of divine service. It is indeed “a badge of Christian men’s professionⁱ;” for though we may attend a place of worship, we cannot be considered as members of the Church, unless we sometimes comply with this last command of its Founder, who hath been pleased, as Augustine^j remarks, to unite “his people into a society by two Sacraments, most easy to be observed, most important in their meaning; the one of which, Baptism, admits into covenant with him; the other, a devout commemoration of his Death, marks continuance in it.” He has left every branch of his Church at liberty to adopt or reject rites and ceremonies, as appears to itself most conducive to edification. But the Sacraments being “ordained by Christ himself,” Christ alone has the power to abrogate. No particular form having been enjoined by him, the manner of administering and receiving, and all that is circumstantial, may vary in different times and places; but the essential parts, the Water in the one, and the Bread and the Wine in the other, no Church can have a right to omit. And yet that corrupt Church, which arrogates to herself exclusively the title of Catholic, and is distinguished by so many doctrinal errors, had, long before the Reformation, taken away from the laity the cup. It has no custom more difficult to defend; for its divines confess, that they cannot in this instance, as they vainly attempt in others, plead antiquity in their favour; and a sufficient confutation is conveyed in the thirtieth Article of our Church, which affirms, that “both parts of the Lord’s

ⁱ Art. xxv.

^j Epist. liv.

Supper, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christian men alike." This withholding the cup naturally arose out of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. To prevent any profanation of what was considered to be the real body of the Lord, small wafers were substituted for bread, and put at once into the mouth of the communicants by the officiating minister, instead of being delivered into the hand; but no expedient could be devised against the occasional spilling of the wine. The practice of withholding it began in the twelfth century, but it was first established by authority in 1414, by the Council of Constance. One of its decrees allows, that the faithful in the primitive Church did receive the Sacrament in both kinds, yet confirmed the practice of giving it to the laity only in one, as being in their opinion reasonably introduced to avoid some dangers and scandals. It is remarkable, that a Pope, in the fifth century, having heard that the Manichæans, who held it sinful to taste wine, did not partake of the cup, decreed, that all persons should either communicate entirely, or be entirely excluded, for that such a dividing of one and the same Sacrament could not be done without heinous sacrilege*. In the Council of Trent, the power of granting the use of the cup to any nation, and the conditions of the grant, were finally left to the Pope, as a question, not of doctrine, but of discipline. To meet the objection of Pope Gelasius, the modern Romanists assert, that the Apostles partook of the bread as Laymen, and were ordained Priests by the act of receiving the cup. But this gratuitous supposition is confuted by our Lord's command, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new Covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins;* for his words show that they were to drink not on account of their office, but of their sinful nature; and the reason applies in every age to all believers

* Gelasius, de duabus naturis Christi.

who are sinners, consequently, therefore, to them all. It appears moreover, that they were not ordained Presbyters till after the Resurrection, when their Master breathed upon them, and said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost.* St. Paul's language shows that the Sacrament is to be received in both kinds; and our Lord in his discourse at Capernaum spake as strongly of the necessity of drinking his blood as of eating his flesh. To vindicate the practice, the Romanist assumes that Christ is received whole and entire in the bread, so that those to whom that alone is given are defrauded thereby of no saving grace; but this argument proves too much, as it would equally answer for withholding the cup from the clergy.

Enthusiasm naturally seizes upon metaphor, and gives it a literal sense; and we may easily conceive, that when writers for a succession of ages have spoken in a declamatory way of the necessity of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, trying to surpass each other in flights of devotion, they might end in maintaining as an article of faith that the bread and wine were by consecration converted into what they represent. This doctrine is called Transubstantiation, because it asserts, that the bread and wine lose their own substance, and become the real body and blood of Christ; yet, as they still appear to be the same as before consecration, this hypothesis is helped out by another, that though the *Substance* be changed, the *Accidents or Qualities* remain¹. If our Lord had not used the words, *This is my body*, preceded sometime before by the discourse, in which he declared, that he who did not eat his body and drink his blood had no life in him, so extraordinary a notion could hardly have ever prevailed. And as it is, it is surprising that any should have adopted a conclusion as revolting to the feelings, as it is contradictory

¹ This paragraph is substantially taken from Hey's Lectures, iv. p. 320.

both to reason and the senses, since a complete solution of the difficulty, if there be any in the words, may be found in figurative language. Cicero says^m, “when we call grain Ceres, and wine Bacchus, we only use an ordinary figure of speech; but do you think,” he adds, “that any one is so devoid of sense as to believe, that what he feeds upon is a God?” It is lamentable to think, that an opinion, which a Heathen considered as too absurd to be received, should be maintained by the largest society of professing Christians as an article of faith. A doctrine so monstrous could only be brought into a regular form in an age of ignorance and superstition. The invention of it is ascribed to Paschasius, a French monk of the ninth century, and it was introduced into our country in the reign of the Conqueror by Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury; but the name does not occur before the thirteenth century, when the doctrine received the sanction of the Church, A.D. 1215, as represented by the third Lateran Council. Objections against it gradually disappeared, and the idea of a sensible presence of Christ in his Church, was henceforward embodied in a visible image, the sacred Host, in honour of which the new festival of Corpus Christi (the body of Christ) was invented. Transubstantiation, though it might not have been intended or foreseen, exalted above measure the office of the Priest, by giving him the power, as one of them expressed it, to make God. Christ, they taught, was in this Sacrament actually brought down from heaven. Sanctification was made dependent upon the will of him who offered him as a sacrifice; and a belief in this mystery came to be regarded as the sum and substance of religion, and the receiving the body of the blessed Lord a substitute for keeping his commandments. The doctrine was fully established by the Council of Trent, which maintained, in opposition to Protestants, that there is no contradiction between Christ’s body being always *naturally*

^m De Natura Deorum, iii.

at God's right hand, and *sacramentally* in other places; that the whole body of Christ exists in every particle, both of the bread and of the wine; and that the same worship that is paid to the true God, is, after consecration, due to the transubstantiated elements. The Romanists appeal both to the written Word, and the unwritten, as they call Tradition; and certainly some of the Fathers have expressed themselves in what, with our experience, we should call incautious language. By giving prominence to their strongest passages, and keeping out of sight others that would qualify them, they certainly may be shown to favour a literal interpretation. Yet what Protestant could desire a more decisive statement than this rule, given by Augustine, *de Doctrina Christiana*ⁿ, to the Western Church? "Understand spiritually what I have spoken. You are not to eat this body which you see, and drink the blood which those who are about to crucify me will shed. I recommend to you a Sacrament, which, spiritually understood, will give you life:" and in his book against Ademantus, he writes, "our Lord did not scruple to say, this is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." The same rule was delivered to the Greek Church by Origen, in his Homily on Leviticus^o; "The understanding our Saviour's words of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, according to the letter, is a *letter that killeth*." Cardinal Du Perron observes, that Origen writes in this passage like a heretic; and, as he denies his authority, I will strengthen it with that of the ecclesiastical historian Theodoret, whose orthodoxy has never been questioned. In his first Dialogue, he tells us, that "Christ would have those who partake of the divine mysteries, not to attend to the nature of things which are seen, but by the change of names to believe the change that is made by grace; for he honoured the symbols with the name of his body and blood, not changing nature, but adding grace to

ⁿ iii. 16.

^o Levit. x.

nature." And in his second Dialogue, that "the mystical symbols after consecration do not pass out of their own nature, for they remain in their former substance, figure, and appearance, and may be seen and handled even as before." To those who wish to know the opinion of earlier authors, I transcribe from Justin Martyr's third Disputation with the Jew Trypho, his declaration, that the "bread of the Eucharist was a figure:" from his second Apology, that "our blood and flesh are nourished by the conversion of that food, which we receive in the Eucharist; but that cannot be the natural body and blood of Christ, for no man will say that *that* is converted into the nourishment of our bodies:" and from Clement of Alexandria's *Pædagogue*; "The blood of Christ is two-fold; the one is carnal, by which we are redeemed from death; the other spiritual, by which we are anointed."

The chief Scriptural argument of the Romanist lies in the words, *This is my body*; yet it is remarkable, that Bellarmineⁿ, their most eminent controversialist, grants that Transubstantiation cannot be established from the words of the institution, though their later writers quote this passage as an incontrovertible proof. Cardinal Caietan^o, the opponent of Luther, went so far as to say, that there is nothing in the Gospel which enforces any man to take the words in a proper and not a metaphorical sense; but that the Church having understood them in the former^p, they are to be so

ⁿ De Euch. iii. 13.

^o In Aquinæ, S. iii. 75.

^p These words were expunged from the Roman edition of his works by Pius V. Tillotson, in his Discourse against Transubstantiation, writes, that Bellarmine, Suarez, and Vasquez acknowledge Scotus, the great Schoolman, to have said, that this doctrine cannot evidently be proved from Scripture, which Bellarmine grants to be not improbable; and Suarez and Vasquez allow that Durandus has said as much.

explained. Another Cardinal of an earlier date, who took part in the proceedings of the Council of Constance, Peter Ailly^q, says plainly, that there is no Scriptural evidence for the doctrine, and that the contrary is more rational, and free from absurdity^r, and no ways repugnant to the authority of Scripture; and Biel^s, allowing this, resolves the belief of Transubstantiation into some other Revelation which he supposes to have been made to the Church. Common sense, however, requires a figurative interpretation; for otherwise, unless we assume that this first most solemn celebration of the Sacrament differed from all repetition of it, our Saviour must have distributed his own body while yet speaking, and before it was broken; an incredible supposition. It should also be observed, that in the Greek the article *this* is *τοῦτο*, neuter, and cannot refer to bread, *ἄρτος*, which is a masculine noun; we must therefore refer it to what precedes, and render it, this act of giving or breaking bread represents my body. Even if we allow that he spoke prospectively, we cannot conceive how a Priest by prayer could bring down his glorified body from heaven, separating it from both his soul and his divinity; and if possible for one, that it could be done at the same moment by many in several places. If we may not take Christ's words figuratively, then we must maintain also that he was really a Vine, as he called himself that very evening. The Roman Catholics themselves are obliged to quit the letter for the spirit, in explaining the other half of the same Sacrament; for our Lord does not say, *this wine*, but, *this cup is my blood*; and having given it to them, he called it, though according to their interpretation the change had previously taken place, this product of the vine. St. Paul also^t speaks three times

^q In Canon. Miss. lect. 40.

^r In 4 Sent. quest. 6. art. 2.

^s In Canon. Miss. lect. 40.

^t 1 Cor. xi. 26—28.

of the material substance, after consecration, as still bread. It would have better suited the genius of our language to have said, This *means* or *represents* my body; but in that which was spoken by our Lord, there is no similar term^a, and the idea is expressed by the substantive verb, *is*, and often altogether omitted. And the very ordinance which they had just been celebrating must itself have accustomed the Apostles to this idiom; for the Lamb itself was called^x the Passover, though it was only the *representation* or *sign* of it; and we know that the name was universally transferred to the first which commemorated that event. They do not appear to have been perplexed by the declaration, nor did they desire it to be explained: they had been reproved before for a literal interpretation of our Lord's warning, *Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees*^y, and had seen how their countrymen had erred, when, upon his saying, *the bread that I will give is my flesh*, they exclaimed, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat!*

The discourse at Capernaum has been often brought forward in support of Transubstantiation; yet, as I have observed above, many even of the Roman Catholic writers

^a The thing which signifies is wont to be called by that which it signifies, writes Augustine against Faustus, xx. 21. Thus in the Old Testament, Joseph interpreting Pharaoh's dream, Gen. xli. 26, 27. says of the kine and of the ears, that they *are* years; in the New we read, that the stars *are* the angels, and the candlesticks *are* the churches, Rev. i. 20. and in explaining his parables, Christ says, the seed *is* the word, the field *is* the world, &c. The English reader may object to this statement the occasional use of the word *means*, as in St. Mark ix. 10; “questioning what the rising from the dead should *mean*,” but it ought to have been rendered *be*, as in the original the verb is ἐστι. “This word, said Moses, is the bread which the Lord hath given us to eat: thou seest that the eternal Word of God is the food of the soul.” I cite this passage from Philo (*de Allegoriis*), to show the resemblance in this respect between the style of the Bible, and of the works of this Alexandrian Jew.

^x Exodus xii. 11.

^y Matt. xvi. 6—9.

reject this application of it, and therein show prudence; for that interpretation would furnish a strong argument for infant communion, which they have long left off, and would be directly opposed to the withholding the cup from the laity. It is surprising, that when our Saviour himself supplied the key to unlock his meaning, any who read his words, *The flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life;* should still cling to the literal sense, which does not, if we could pass over the impossibility, afford a reasonable doctrine, as flesh is only fit food for the body, and cannot nourish, for it cannot be conveyed into, the soul; and if the nourishment be only spiritual, so surely ought to be the eating. It is therefore not literally, but only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, that “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, and the mean whereby it is eaten is Faith^z. ” It is material also to observe, in confutation of the literal interpretation, that the Romanist endeavours to escape from one of the difficulties that beset it, by suppressing an important part of the form of Consecration. Their Priest stops at *This is my body*, whereas our Saviour proceeds to say, *given*, or, as reported by St. Paul, *broken for you*, that is, offered up to God in sacrifice; and surely these additional omitted words are decisive, for it was only on the Cross that his body was broken and his blood shed. At the Resurrection, when he showed that he had power to resume the life that he had laid down, “he took again his body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man’s nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, where he sitteth” our Priest and Mediator, “until he return to judge all men at the last day^a, ” and that body which was for a very short season broken, is now glorified. Dr. Hales maintains, that these present participles, διδόμενον, κλώμενον, ἐκχυνόμενον, are to be taken as futures, and appeals to the authority of the

^a Art. xxviii.

^b Art. iv.

Canon of the Mass, which retains the whole of Christ's words respecting the blood, and renders *ἐκχυνόμενον, effundetur*, not shed, but about to be shed, following in this faithfully the Vulgate translation. Those who are not acquainted with the Roman Service, will learn with astonishment that it cannot be reconciled with Transubstantiation, no doubt because it is substantially anterior to the doctrine. It is only the Elevation, Adoration, and other ceremonies required in the Rubric, which is of a much later date, that give a countenance to this dogma; for *after* consecration, the Priest prays God, that "as he had accepted the sacrifice of his just servant Abel, and the holy sacrifice of Abraham, the immaculate victim (host), and that which Melchisedek the high priest offered, so he would deign to look with a propitious and serene countenance on what is offered out of his gifts, a pure holy immaculate victim (host), the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of perpetual salvation^b." And it is no less remarkable, that this is the gloss of the Canon Law, upon a passage in Augustine^c. The heavenly Sacrament, which truly represents the flesh of Christ, is called the body of Christ, but improperly, whence it is said after a manner; so that the meaning is, it is called the

^b It may be satisfactory to some to read the Prayer in the original Latin. I have therefore transcribed it from the Missal, corrected in conformity with the decree of the Council of Trent, which has been used ever since in all Roman Catholic places of worship. This Prayer, which has not been altered, is precisely the same in the Liber Sacramentorum of Gregory the Great, and is supposed to have been in use before Pope Gelasius. Offerimus præclaræ majestati tuæ de tuis donis ac datis hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitæ æternæ et calicem salutis perpetuæ; supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris: et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel, et sacrificium Patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ et quod tibi obtulit summus Sacerdos tuus Melchisedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam.

^c Epist. xxiii.

body of Christ, that is, it signifies the body of Christ^b. I conclude in the words of Augustine, “ How shall I send up my hands to heaven to take hold of Christ sitting there ? Send thy faith, and thou hast hold of him. Why prepest thou thy teeth ? Believe, and thou hast eaten : for this is to eat the living bread. He that believeth on Christ eateth Christ, he is invisibly fed^c.”

Transubstantiation is declared, in the twenty-eighth Article of our Church, both “ to be repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and to overthrow the nature of a Sacrament,” which, according to the ancient definition, consists of a sign, and the thing it signifies. This has never been disputed in that of Baptism ; but the Roman Catholic doctrine excludes from the Lord’s Supper its outward visible sign, since it maintains, that the elements are changed into the body. According to our Catechism, our souls are strengthened and refreshed in this Sacrament “ by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.” The Body and Blood of Christ, therefore, are only the benefits of Christ’s Passion, our eating and drinking of that Body and Blood our being made partakers of those benefits, and the mouth whereby we thus eat and drink is our true and lively faith. “ This,” says Archbishop Sharp^d, “ is plainly the sense of our Church in this matter ; because she hath expressly affirmed, that Christ hath but one Body, and that that Body is now in heaven, and not here.” Anxious, however, that her members should not degrade the Sacrament to an ordinance, she does not hesitate to declare, that “ the Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken and received ;” but to guard the declaration against misconception, she is careful to show, that the taking is figurative, by limiting this receiving to the “ faithful ;” and by maintaining, that “ the wicked, and such as be void of

^b De Consecratione.

• Tract. 50. in Evang. Joan.

^d Vol. vii. Sermon xv.

a lively faith," although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing ^e."

Our opponents defeated in argument, take refuge in mystery; and lays open the vital doctrines of Revelation to the attacks of infidels, by classing them with this dogma, as equally indefensible by reasoning, and incredible, except to faith. This demand of implicit assent is one of the main causes of the notorious prevalence of infidelity in Roman Catholic countries; for persons in communion with the Pope, not having been taught to *give a reason of the hope that is in them*, when they discover the absurdity of Transubstantiation, and are told that the exercise of the understanding in matters of religion is forbidden, receive upon the authority of the Church this and whatever doctrine she requires with as much confidence as the truths of holy writ, or reject with them the whole of Christianity, as a fable. They have never learnt, and infidels will not allow, the difference between doctrines being *above*, and *contrary to*, reason. The assertions that the wafer, used instead of bread, notwithstanding to the eye and taste it has undergone no alteration, is human flesh, and that the same identical body can be offered up at the same instant in several places, are irreconcileable to reason; nor is it less so, we grant, that the same Being can be three and one, in the same sense of the words. But the true doctrine of the Trinity, which, while it maintains the Unity of the Divine Essence, affirms that in that Unity are three Personal distinctions, though it be above the power of our intellect to fathom, is not like these dogmas contradictory to it.

Transubstantiation, however, is not only a stumbling-block, which has driven many from the privileges and consolations

^e Art. xxix.

of the Gospel into infidelity. To those who acquiesce in this doctrine, belief of it is not an inoperative error, but brings in its train many pernicious consequences unfavourable to holiness, and to the full development of the Christian character. When it is believed that the wafer is changed into the actual body of our Redeemer, we can neither blame nor wonder at the piety that reserves and enshrines it. With this change is connected the doctrine of its being offered up as a Sacrifice, and therefore it is called, from *Hostia*, the Latin word for victim, the *Host*. Hence naturally followed an undue exaltation of the Minister's office, for a victim requires a Sacrificer; nor is it extraordinary that one who, it is believed, can convert a wafer into God, and then offer him upon an altar, should be regarded with greater reverence than is due from one fallible mortal to another. History has proved the injurious effects of these doctrines on both Clergy and Laity, and Protestant authors enlarge upon them; but few sufficiently consider, that they eclipse the glory of the Intercessory office of our Lord, who is the only Priest of the New Covenant, (in the proper acceptance of the term, that is, a sacrificer, Ἱερεὺς, not an elder or presbyter, Πρεσβύτερος,) and so bring us back by an unexpected road to a Levitical priesthood, and *the weak and beggarly elements* of the Law. To do away these erroneous notions, our Reformers substituted for the Altar, a *Table*, and have carefully avoided all phrases that might foster superstition. From Transubstantiation has proceeded the belief, avowed by the Roman Church, of what is technically called *Opus operatum*, that is, that the body and blood possess an intrinsic virtue, which does not depend upon the disposition of the receiver, but operates upon all who do not obstruct the operation by mortal sin. It is difficult even to conceive a more pernicious tenet. Its obvious tendency is to substitute the form of religion for its power, and to give a false and premature security to

a guilty conscience when mercifully awakened to a sense of danger, which, if duly improved, might lead it to rely not upon this sacramental feeding, or upon any act of its own, but upon the Sacrifice of himself offered by the Saviour once for all, upon the Cross. So deeply rooted is this fatal error, and so congenial a soil has it found in our fallen nature, ever ready to evade, if possible, the necessity of leading a holy life, that an indefinite feeling of this kind has in our country survived the downfal of popery; for unhappily too many professing Protestants seek in death the Sacrament they have neglected during life, not from a just appreciation of it, but as a charm or preservative from damnation: an error which derives no countenance from the Church of England, as it expressly declares^f, that "the Sacraments have a wholesome effect or operation in such only as worthily receive the same."

Having shown, as I hope satisfactorily, that, to speak with Chrysostom, "Christ honoured the visible symbols with the name of his Body and Blood, not changing the nature, but adding Grace to Nature," I proceed to consider the design of the institution; and this we learn from our Lord's command, *Do this in remembrance of me*. But in what does this remembrance consist? Clearly it requires a correct notion both of what our Lord is, and what he has done for us. And we learn from other passages in Scripture, that the *only-begotten Son of the Father* is *God manifest in the flesh*^g, and that his death was *a propitiation for the sins of the whole world*^h. Such a remembrance, when made with a proper disposition of mind, is at once an act of gratitude for this inestimable benefit, and of humiliation for the sin that rendered it necessary; since by these "visible words," to use an expression of Augustine, we declare that this all-sufficient Sacrifice can alone procure our acceptance. A due commemoration of our Lord's

^f Art. xxv.

^g 1 Tim. iii. 16.

^h 1 John ii. 3.

death therefore, including as it does a public avowal of the leading doctrines of our religion, is a protest against infidelity, and even the natural tendency of such a commemoration cannot fail to be beneficial. But our Lord also said of the bread, *this is my Body, given for you;* and of the cup, *this is my Blood of the new covenant, which is shed for you.* New Covenant, of course, suggests the recollection of a former one; and the occasion when it was instituted, after the Paschal Supper, eaten to commemorate the passing of the destroying Angel over the houses of the Israelites, the doors of which had been marked with the blood of a lamb, carries our thoughts back to that great national deliverance, which we are thus taught to consider as a typical one. Our Lord says in effect, This is the blood not of the Paschal Lamb, but of myself; not of that old Covenant ratified by the blood of bulls and of goats, which could never take away the guilt of sin, but by that blood which is accepted by God as a real expiation, and that not for one favoured people, but for the whole race of mankind. When we consider also, that it was the custom of ancient nations to drink blood, or wine instead of blood, for the ratifying of covenants, we are led to regard this ordinance as more than a mere commemoration, though we cannot, like the Romanist, regard it as a sacrifice. That doctrine is expressly and strongly renounced in our thirty-first Article, entitled, "Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross," a title which implies that it is not to be repeated on an altar. It opens with this proposition, taken with some additional words from St. John's first Epistle¹, "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone." Now if this can be established, the sacrifice of the Mass cannot be

¹ 1 John ii. 2.

maintained: for if the death of Christ upon the cross was a perfect satisfaction for all sin, it would be absurd to argue for another. That such a sacrifice should be offered but once, we might reasonably expect; but, as if it were to protest against this pernicious error of a future age, the continual repetition of this sacrifice, the fact of its taking place but once, is prominently brought forward again and again in the Epistle to the Hebrews: *We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all^k.* *Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins and then for the people, for this he did once when he offered up himself^l.* *He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption^m.* *Christ was once offered to bear the sins of manyⁿ.* *Every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin; but this Man, after he had offered up one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God^o.* *Now once at the end of the world he hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* St. Peter also writes to the same effect; *Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God^p.* We may therefore affirm, in the language of this Epistle, *that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin^r.*

The Council of Trent lays down the position, that though Christ was a Priest for ever, he did not mean that earthly Priesthood should cease. Accordingly, the night before he was betrayed, he offered up to his heavenly Father his body and blood, under the symbols of bread and wine, and ordained his Apostles Priests, that they and their successors might afterwards offer him up; though there was to be still but one Priest, the Apostles acting only for their Lord.

^k Heb. x. 10. ^l Heb. vii. 27. ^m Heb. ix. 12. ⁿ Heb. ix. 28.
^o Heb. x. 11, 12. ^p Heb. ix. 26. ^q 1 Pet. iii. 18.
^r Heb. x. 26.

This appointed Sacrifice was to be a real one, no less than the original which it represented, the only difference being that it was unbloody, and offered in a different manner; for it is declared to be strictly propitiatory, capable of gaining remission of even great sins, and to be offered for the dead as well as the living. The doctrine was first established in the dark ages, yet like other errors it grew gradually, and might originate from the strong and unguarded language of the Fathers, who sometimes called it the unbloody sacrifice. Still, however, in their most oratorical declamation, expressions occur which show that their words are not to be taken literally; for the Christians were reproached by the heathen for professing a religion which had no Sacrifice, and the Fathers in their Apologies allowed the truth of the charge. Thus Justin Martyr^s says, "that God has no need of blood, libation, or incense, but that the Christian manner was to offer him prayers and thanksgivings; and that the only way of paying him suitable honour, was not to consume by fire what he has given us for our sustenance, but to spend it upon ourselves and upon the poor, and to render him the grateful tribute of our hymns." "We sacrifice indeed, but it is with pure prayer, as God has commanded," writes Tertullian, "for God, the Creator of the Universe, hath no need of any incense or blood^t." And again, "the spiritual sacrifices of praise are designed, when it is said, pay thy vows to the Most High; and, in another passage of Scripture, a troubled spirit is declared to be the acceptable sacrifice to God^u." And Origen^x observes, that Celsus, objecting that the Christians had no altar, "does not consider, that with us every good man's mind is his altar, from whence truly and spiritually the perfume of incense is sent up, that is, prayers from a pure conscience." Dr. Waterland, who from his intimate study of the Fathers is of the highest

^s Apol. i. p. 19. ^t Ad Scap. ii. 69. ^u Adv. Jud. v. 188.

^x Contra Celsum, p. 755.

authority, declares, that they will all be found constant and uniform in one tenor of doctrine, rejecting all material sensible sacrifices, and admitting none but spiritual ones, as prayers and praises. The whole of the matter, as he says, is well comprised in a sermon of Abp. Sharp; "We offer up our alms; we offer up our prayers, our praises, and ourselves; and all these we offer up in the virtue and consideration of Christ's Sacrifice, represented by way of Commemoration; nor can it be proved that the ancients did more than this: this whole service was their Christian Sacrifice, and this is ours." "We do not deny," continues this Prelate^y, "that the Communion Office may be called a Sacrifice, nor do we scruple to call this service the Christian Sacrifice by way of eminence, because we find the ancient Fathers frequently so styling it; but then it is only upon these three accounts; first, that we bring our offerings to God for the use of the poor, with which kind of sacrifice St. Paul tells us *God is well pleased*, which alms and oblations made up one great part of that unbloody sacrifice that the Fathers so often speak of; secondly, we offer up our prayers and thanksgivings for ourselves, and our intercessions for the whole Church; and thirdly, to complete the Christian Sacrifice, we offer up both with a particular regard to that one Sacrifice of Christ which he offered upon the Cross, and which is now represented before our eyes, in the symbols of bread and wine. What then do we not offer every day? says Chrysostom. Yes, we offer by making a Commemoration of his death: and we do not make another sacrifice every day, but always the same, or rather a remembrance of that Sacrifice. And in the same sense, says Eusebius, we sacrifice a remembrance of the great Sacrifice." In these three things consisted the whole of the Christian Sacrifice, as it was held by the primitive Church; and so we, in our Communion Service, having offered up our sacrifice

^y Vol. vii. Sermon xi.

of alms, and our sacrifice of devotion for the rendering these two acceptable, plead before God the Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Fathers, accustomed on the one side to the temple service, on the other to heathen sacrifices, were naturally led to adopt metaphorical language, which appears strange and forced to us who know of both only from books. In this they follow Scripture; for St. Paul declares, in a metaphor drawn from the Mosaic ritual, that he would willingly be *offered (poured as a drink offering) upon the sacrifice and service of the faith* of his Philippian converts^z; and he invites the Roman Christians^a to offer up themselves to God *as a living sacrifice*. Moreover, *praise and good works* are called a *sacrifice* in the epistle to the Hebrews^b; and in Hosea^c, the *calves*, that is, the offerings, *of the lips* are put for prayer.

The early Church offered not only alms, but oblations; and though the practice has ceased, we have introduced into our Communion Service the word, though in a different sense, that is, for the other devotions of the people in addition to their alms. The original oblation was the Bread and Wine contributed by the congregation, of which, after it had been solemnly presented to God, the minister took a part, and by consecration made it, according to the language of that time, the Body and Blood of Christ; which being done, he distributed, so that the people, having offered to God, were by him feasted at his table with part of their own offerings, as they had been formerly with the peace offerings under the Mosaic dispensation. This was much more strikingly the case when the Lord's Supper was followed by the love-feast, from which custom may be traced the doctrine of a Sacrifice offered in the Sacrament.

The reasoning in the epistle to the Hebrews seems to prove, that no sacrifice that requires to be repeated can

^z Phil. ii. 17.

^a Rom. xii. 1.

^b Heb. xiii. 15, 16. xii. 1.

^c Hosea xiv. 2.

take away sin; that the one once made was sufficient, and therefore is not to be repeated; and that no man can be a priest in the room of Christ to repeat the Christian sacrifice. It is evident also, that this doctrine depends upon Transubstantiation; and if this has been disproved, then at the utmost, the Bread and Wine can be no more than the commemoration of a sacrifice. I know only two texts in the Old Testament to which Romanists appeal in proof of the contrary tenet. The first is Jehovah's declaration by Malachi^a, *that in every place a pure offering shall be offered*; but *Mincha*, the word so rendered here, and in other places meat offering, means an unbloody sacrifice. If, then, it is to be taken literally, it will contradict Transubstantiation; and a *pure offering* [of flour], an unbloody sacrifice, does not answer to the Trent definition that this is propitiatory, for, to use the Apostle's words, *without shedding of blood there is no remission^e* and where *remission is, there is no more offering for sin^f*. The Roman Church is thus convicted of contradiction, in calling the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper an unbloody offering, by Seymour^g, in his "Mornings with the Jesuits;" and the father, to whom he stated his objection, was silenced, confessing that he perceived that the objection charged the Church with using the same argument both ways, and in opposite directions, and that he did not see how to answer it. I called his attention, continues Seymour, to the fact, that when Protestants object that if the sacrifice of the Mass be identical with that on the Cross, this daily sacrificing of Christ must be a daily suffering to him; for, as the Apostle says, *He was not to offer himself often, for then he must have suffered often from the foundation of the world;* and he answered, that there are no sufferings, because it is an unbloody sacrifice. But, according to the Trent decision, the wine is substantially changed into the blood. The Roman

^a Malachi i. 11.

^e Heb. ix. 22.

^f Heb. x. 18.

^g Seymour, 2. Conv.

Church maintains that the bread becomes flesh, and the wine blood, on pronouncing the words of consecration; she teaches, therefore, at the same time, that the sacrifice is bloody and unbloody. We conclude therefore, that, like other sacrificial terms so often applied to the Christian service by the Prophets, it is to be taken as a figure for our Commemoration of Christ's death, and deduce from this very passage to which they appeal an additional argument, that "the sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, are blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits^h." The second passage is the Apostle's reference to the fact, that the king of Salem, who was also priest of the most high God, brought forth bread and wine to refresh *Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him, to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all.* This fact, had it not received an inspired comment, might have appeared to us unimportant. But first, David, in that memorable Psalm, by the opening of which his *Lord* silenced his own enemies, foretels of him that he is a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec. And long after the Apostle explains how this *King of righteousness* and *King of peace* is a type of *the great High Priest*, who was not a temporary one, after the order of Aaron. This passage is even still less favourable to the Roman Catholic doctrine than the first, for the bread and wine were not brought forth as an act of religion, but to refresh Abraham and his followers; and the reasoning shows, that as Christ is a Priest for ever now pleading the merits of his one sacrifice of himself, and interceding for his people, there is no longer a victim to be offered; and consequently, since every priest must *have something to offer*^k, that there are no successors to Christ in the Priesthood, that is, in the Sacrificer's office.

While, however, we strenuously maintain that Christ alone can offer up Christ as a Sacrifice, and that his ministers

^h Art. xxxi.

ⁱ Heb. vii.

^k Heb. viii.

are only authorized to commemorate this Sacrifice offered *once for all*, and not by man but for man, we regard the Eucharist as a federal rite, carrying with it on God's part the force of a contract, that (fit qualification on our part presumed) this symbolical communion shall be as a deed of conveyance instrumentally investing us with the benefits of Christ's death. If we make the Lord's Supper a mere commemoration, we make it a strange and unintelligible rite; but if we consider it as a Feast upon a Sacrifice, its meaning is easy and simple. When sacrifices were in use, part of the victim was served up at a religious feast, and all who partook of it were understood to partake also of the spiritual benefits of the offering. Now Christ is our victim; on his body we do not literally feast, because it is in heaven; but he appointed bread to represent it; on that we can feast, and so partake of his body: and such bread is the Bread of life, because by his own appointment it represents his flesh. This view, illustrated by Cudworth, was adopted by Warburton as an effectual answer both to the Roman Catholic system, which exalts the Eucharist into a Sacrifice, and the Socinian, which considers it as no more than a discharge on man's part of a positive duty, throwing out that essential part of a Sacrament which belongs to God, who, according to the Homily (on the Common Prayer and Sacraments), "herein embraces us, and offers himself to be embraced by us." I apprehend, that in receiving the Eucharist in a right frame of mind, we not only commemorate our Saviour's death, but obtain remission of our sins, and the gift of sanctifying Grace, by which "God doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him;" and this seems to be acknowledged in the final prayer of our Communion Service; "Thou dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son."

It is a painful consideration, that, notwithstanding the

general improvement both in the knowledge and practice of religion, there are still many regular attendants in our churches who rarely or ever partake of "these holy mysteries," which our Master and only Saviour "hath instituted as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort." This systematic neglect of an ordinance so solemnly enjoined must arise from some misconception of its nature, or of the qualifications of a communicant. All know that it was grossly abused by the Corinthians, who perverted this feast into an occasion of intemperance; and many now, without due consideration, apply to themselves the language in which St. Paul¹ reproves those unworthy communicants. The lapse of time since the publication of the authorized version, by affecting the meaning of a word he employs, has increased their alarm; for, reading that the Corinthians^m ate and drank to themselves *damnation*, they fear lest, by participating, they should incur eternal punishment; though reflection might satisfy them, that damnation was then equivalent to *condemnation*, and that from the context only can we learn to which world it refers. If they would read the whole chapter, they could not fail to observe, that the Apostle was speaking of temporal judgments; for he says of these who did not discern the *Lord's body*, *many among them were weak and sickly, and many slept*. The use of the latter term shows, that even those who had died had departed in the Lord; and the *weak and sickly*, he warns, that *they are chastened, that they should not be condemned with the world*. None, from our mode of receiving this Sacrament, can now be guilty of not distinguishing the Lord's body from a common meal; and the very fear itself which causes such to absent themselves, is a proof that they would not willingly receive it in an unworthy manner. Their absence is indeed to be ascribed to a mistaken

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 29.

^m 1 Cor. xi. 29.

humility, which doubts their being included in the invitation, and fears that it would be presumption in them to come till they had made themselves worthy. But however specious the form that it assumes may be, it must be a false scruple that keeps them from obeying their Lord's positive command. That degree of holiness, which some consider as an indispensable qualification for this Sacrament, can hardly be attained except by partaking of it, and in obeying our Lord's other commands. The feeblest aspiration after the power of obeying the Divine will, is a sufficient warrant for any to communicate; for they may be assured, that such a desire is excited by the Holy Spirit, in order to draw them to God, and if it be followed, more assistance will be given, so that the weakest and most diffident believer may proceed from strength to strength, in the use of this ordinance, which, he should never forget, is also a Sacrament, that is, "not only a badge of his profession, but an effectual sign of grace, by the which God doth work invisibly, and doth not only quicken, but strengthen and confirm our faith in himⁿ." So persevering, he will become gradually more and more conformed to the image of him who instituted it.

126, 127. His last Discourse, in which he comforts his disciples, especially with the promise of the Holy Spirit. John xiv. xv. xvi.

What Jesus had already said concerning his departure, could not fail to distress the Apostles: he therefore directed them to the only true source of consolation, reliance upon God^a and upon himself. *Let not your heart be troubled;*

ⁿ Art. xxv.

^a *Ye believe in God, believe also in me,* is the authorized version of πιστεύετε εἰς Θεὸν καὶ πιστεύετε εἰς ἐμὲ: but Nonnus and the Greek commentators, whose opinion on a grammatical point must have peculiar weight, consider that the verb is in both places in the same mood, and that it should be the imperative seems probable from the 11th verse, πιστεύετε μοι ὅτι ἔγώ εἰν τῷ Πατρί.

believe in God, and believe in me. They were looking forward to an earthly kingdom; he therefore said, to comfort them under their disappointment, *In my Father's house are many mansions*; that is, if I understand^o him aright, that in the Universe are many worlds besides this, and that he goes to no solitary enjoyment, but *to prepare a place* for them. This could be done only through his death. He goes on to say, *I will come again, and receive you unto myself.* Lest they should distrust the promise, he added, *whither I go ye know, and the place ye know.* Thomas, still clinging to the notion of the Messiah's visible earthly kingdom, confessed ignorance, and this led Jesus to announce himself as *the Way, the Truth, and the Life.* And not only did he declare himself to be the true and living and only Way of coming to the Father, but that he is so united with the Father in counsel and action, that he who has known the one, may be said to know the other. This declaration perplexed a second disciple, Philip, who said, *Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.* He therefore confirmed and explained it, by telling him, that he who hath seen him hath seen the Father. He then spoke of his union with the

^o The ordinary explanation of the text is, that these *many mansions* are all in heaven, and that as in the parable, the king places one faithful servant over five cities, and another over ten, so of the believers who shall be admitted into heaven, some will be placed in more glorious abodes than others, in proportion to their good works on earth, though none will have a right or inclination to complain, since they will enjoy all the happiness and render all the service of which they are capable. This is I believe true doctrine; and I should also have believed it to be the true interpretation of the passage if it had been a detached aphorism, but it appears to me irreconcilable with the context. To the believer, to whom few opportunities of service have been granted, this is a most consolatory declaration; but surely it is not the inferior mansions that are allotted to the Apostles; and indeed our Lord says in the context, that where he is, there they shall be also.

Father in terms which imply the partaking of his Nature ; and assured them, *that they shall do greater works than he himself had done*^p, because he goes to the Father, and that he himself will grant whatever petitions they put up. This shows him to be equal to the Father, and he gives us a reason for doing it, *that the Father may be glorified in the Son.* He added for their encouragement, that he will pray the Father, who will send them *another Paraclete*, even *the Spirit of truth*, whom *the world cannot receive*, but who shall abide with them, not as he had done for a season, but for ever, and that his indwelling influence should be more beneficial to them than his own personal presence. He said, he would not leave them destitute, like orphans, but would soon return, and manifest himself to those who proved their love to him by keeping his commandments. A third disciple, Judas, showed that it was their carnal expectation which prevented their understanding him, by asking how he would manifest himself to them, and not unto the world. He did not give a direct answer, but turned their attention to what it especially concerned them to know and believe, that if they loved and would obey him, both himself and the Father would love them, and make their abode in them, and that the Holy Spirit would remind them of what he had taught, and would explain what they could not now understand. He then left them the precious legacy of peace of mind, which he calls his, because it can only be obtained through him ; which he

^p It must, however, never be forgotten, that as their works were wrought through the Spirit which he imparted, they demonstrate the power not of the agent but of the giver. But what can these works be ? It is commonly answered, miracles. The gift of tongues is, I believe, the only kind that had not been exercised by our Lord, for which he had no occasion, yet it can hardly be considered as greater than raising the dead. I therefore take the work to mean the effect produced by miracles, that is, their greater success in propagating his religion.

gives not as the world gives, a gift but in name, no better than an ineffectual wish, whereas his is an actual grant; and he subjoined, that if they loved him, they would rejoice at his departure, because his Father was greater than he. The Father is greater, because he had for a season divested himself of the form of God, and had assumed the infirmities of the flesh, “for us men, and for our salvation.” He continued, that he would not converse much longer with them, for the *Prince of this world was coming*, and would prevail over him, though *he had nothing in him*, (that is, could find in him no sinful inclination;) for he himself was ready to yield, because he *loved the Father*, and so the *Father gave him commandment*.

Jesus now broke off the discourse, by saying, *Arise, let us go hence*. It is, however, immediately resumed, according to some commentators, on the way to the Mount of Olives: but this seems most improbable, when we consider its nature, and the number addressed; and therefore I presume that it must have been before they quitted the room, perhaps on leaving the table. He illustrated the union that ought to subsist between himself and his people, by a comparison which, from its frequent recurrence in the Old Testament, would be familiar to them. The Church had been symbolized in Prophecy^q by a vineyard, in which God had planted the *choicest Vine*, which, when it degenerated and brought forth *wild grapes*, was threatened with extirpation. By calling himself the true Vine, Jesus intimated that it was founded upon himself, and warned them that it was to be subject to the same discipline as under the Jewish Dispensation. As the husbandman cuts off every barren branch, and prunes every bearing one that it may produce more and better fruit; so his Father, who is glorified by his people bearing much fruit, will remove the useless members of the Church, and by fatherly chastisements improve the

^q Isaiah v.

good. A branch when cut off from the parent stock withers ; and so the believer can do nothing who is separated from the Saviour, the Author of his spiritual life. He charged them therefore to abide in him, and promised that he would abide in them. He exhorted them to continue to possess the love with which he then loved them, by keeping his commandments, especially his new one of mutual love, even to the degree in which he had shown it, of dying for one another, and condescended to call them no longer *servants* but *friends*, because he had confidentially communicated to them all that he had heard from his Father. Since they were his, they must expect to suffer from the same hatred which he had experienced from the world, which had *hated him*, as had been foretold, *without a cause*, and this hatred would proceed to such a length, that their enemies would not only excommunicate them, but would consider the putting them to death an act as acceptable to God as sacrifice. He endeavoured to moderate their grief, by assuring them that his departure would be even advantageous for them, for unless he departed, he could not send unto them the Holy Spirit. And he informed them for their consolation, that this other Advocate will, by conferring miraculous powers on them, convince the world of its sin of unbelief in putting him to death ; of his righteousness, as vindicated by his ascension to his Father ; and of judgment, by his condemnation, as would be proved in the triumph of his religion, and by its inward working upon the heart. *Howbeit*, he continued, *when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all the truth*^r. This promise was preeminently fulfilled to those to whom it was addressed ; but the extravagances of enthusiasts of every age, from

^r Our version here, as frequently in other passages, drops the Article, and in none more unfortunately ; for it leads the reader to think of truth of various kinds, instead of religious truth alone, the only one here intended.

Montanus to those who are yet living, should not tempt us, as it has many, to limit to Apostles an assurance so encouraging to all; for it is in harmony with a former declaration of the same gracious Lord, *My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man be willing to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be from God, or whether I speak from myself.* The following sentence duly weighed would guard it from abuse; since it teaches, that no new revelation of doctrine or commandment is to be expected. *He shall not speak of himself, he shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.* The Word of God is the instrument by which the Spirit of God worketh, and it is in order to comprehend the real depths of that word that he opens the understanding*. This promise of

* This doctrine has been so happily illustrated by Dr. Chalmers, that I will state it in the language of that eminent Divine: "He does not tell us any thing that is out of the record; but all that is within it he sends home with clearness and effect upon the mind. He does not make us wise above that which is written; but wise up to that which is written. When a telescope is directed to some distant landscape, it enables us to see what could not otherwise be seen; but it does not enable us to see any thing which has not a real existence in the prospect before us. The natural eye saw nothing but blue land stretching along the distant horizon: by the aid of the glass, there bursts upon it a charming variety of fields and woods, and spires and villages. Yet who would say, that the glass added one feature to this assemblage? It discovers nothing to us which is not there, nor out of that portion of the book of nature we are employed in contemplating does it bring into view a single character which is not previously inscribed upon it. And so of the Spirit. He does not add a single truth or a single character to the Book of Revelation. He enables the spiritual man, indeed, to see what the natural man cannot see; but the spectacle which he lays open is uniform and immutable. It is the Word of God, which is ever the same; and he, whom the Spirit of God has enabled to look to the Bible with a clear and affecting discernment, sees no phantom passing before him; but, amid all the visionary extravagance with which he is charged, can,

the Holy Spirit might suffice to comfort them for the loss of their Advocate and Teacher, but the deprivation of instruction was not their only cause of grief; the approaching departure of their Friend was a more overpowering one. In order, therefore, that they might not be overcome with grief, he joined with his departure an assurance of his return after *a little while*, when their sorrow would be turned into a joy that would be permanent, *for no man should take it from them*. Our Lord allowed that there had been hitherto some obscurity in his discourse, for he added, *These things have I spoken to you in proverbs*. To us, to whom the Crucifixion and Resurrection are past events, his words are clear; but we are apt to forget, that these events had not been anticipated by the Apostles as possible, nor is it on consideration so astonishing, as he called his death his departure, that they should suppose that he spoke not of going out of the world, but to some other country, probably to the Jews of the Dispersion. The termination of the discourse produced the desired effect, and satisfied them; for they said, *Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and we believe that thou camest forth from God*. To check their growing self-confidence, he forewarned them of their approaching desertion of him, saying, that though every one of them left him, he should not even then be really alone, because the Father would be with him. To sustain and comfort them under their impending trials and sufferings, he said in conclusion, *These things I have spoken unto you, that in me you might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer,—you have no reason to despond,—I have overcome the world.*

for every one article of faith and every one duty of his practice, make his triumphant appeal to the law and to the testimony.” Chalmers, Disc. i. p. 33, 34.

128. *His prayer for himself and his people. John xvii.*

Our Saviour closed his consolatory address with a Prayer, which he permitted his Apostles to hear. We may perhaps acquire a more intimate knowledge of the feelings of our great High Priest from this communication with his Father, than from any other portion of the sacred volume; and we may regard it as a specimen of the prevailing Intercession which he is ever making in heaven for those whom he has constituted his brethren, by taking upon him their nature.

In this and in other places in holy writ we are favoured with a glimpse of our Saviour's Priesthood, which involves truths the most profound and the most encouraging; but a connected and argumentative view of that office was reserved for the Epistle to the Hebrews. That exposition of the shadows of the law exhibits to us, under the type of Aaron entering within the veil into the most holy place, this our true and only Priest converting Heaven itself (of which the earthly sanctuary was but a figure) into a Temple. For as the Levitical priest on the day of Atonement sprinkled the mercy-seat with the blood of the victim which had been slain in the presence of the people in the court without; so this Priest, *after the order of Melchisedec*, whose office as Intercessor is perpetual, having publicly offered upon the altar of the cross his *one sacrifice of himself for sins once offered, now appears* continually in his Father's *presence* to plead the merits of that offering. It was with a reference to this part of the office which he still sustains, that he showed himself to St. John in Patmos^a in *a garment down to the feet*, the sacerdotal robe, and afterwards^x as an Angel, mixing in a *golden censer the prayers of all the saints*, with the incense, which represents his own prevailing Intercession.

The office of a Priest consisted of two parts, Sacrifice

^a Rev. i. 13.

^x Rev. viii. 3.

and Intercession. Christians are now happily nearly unanimous in acknowledging that their Lord has fulfilled the first by his expiatory offering of himself. The second is by too many still overlooked: and yet it is the more important, as giving efficacy to the former; for the Sacrifice *then* offered, is *now* applied to believers, and therefore Jesus did not lay aside his priestly functions on entering into his glory, but remains a *Priest for ever*, to lead a mediatorial life in heaven for the benefit of his people. This is their *strong consolation, the anchor of their souls^a*, through which, though tossed on the stormy sea of life, they still ride secure, since Jesus *their forerunner hath fixed it within the veil*; and this expectation encourages and authorizes them *to come boldly with filial confidence to God, as seated upon a throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need^b*. Christ's intercession, to which all his temporary sufferings were but preparatory, ought to be ever in our thoughts; for its supreme importance is strongly expressed by the Apostle: *being reconciled by his death, we are saved by his life^c*. *It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who also maketh intercession for us^d*. And that our High Priest not only intercedes for his Church, but for each individual member of it, appears from St. John's first Epistle, *If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins^e*. The declaration is well qualified to cheer the timid believer with the hope of final perseverance; for, if he whom the Father heareth always is ever interceding for him, why should he apprehend that the suggestions of his spiritual enemy, or the fascinations of the world, should cause him to fall away? And let it be carefully observed, that the comfort offered is guarded against any Antinomian abuse; for the sins

^a Heb. vi. 18, 20.

^b Heb. iv. 16.

^c Rom. v. 10.

^d Rom. viii. 34.

^e 1 John ii. 1.

here spoken of are evidently not wilful deliberate offences, but such negligences as a pious believer may be betrayed into by inadvertence and ignorance, or the force of unexpected temptation. This appears from the context, which shows, that the *any man* of the Apostle, as it is rendered, is not any human being, but, any one of these whom he calls *little children*, and from the whole tenor of the Epistle, which is addressed to those who evidenced themselves by their conduct, to be so *born of God* as not to commit sin^d.

Intercession is an idea so congenial to the understanding and feelings, that as soon as it is stated, we perceive its suitability to our condition; and even those who have not been enlightened by Revelation, have an indistinct indefinite notion of it. Deists who live in a Christian country, retaining what portion they please of the faith which they abjure, call the scheme, which they have thus formed at will, the Religion of Nature. But to ascertain the real light of Nature, we must refer to the travels of those who have visited barbarous countries, or to the still existing writings of Greece and Rome, which are in this respect of such peculiar value. Instead of the Being described to us as all benevolence, and as, if not indifferent to human concerns, too kind to punish sin, Tradition has handed down universally gods superior to men in power, but rarely in virtue, objects not of love but of fear: and their wrath is to be appeased by acts of painful mortification, and in extraordinary cases by expiatory sacrifices of what is most precious in the estimation of their worshippers, not merely with *thousands of rams or with ten thousand of rivers of oil*, but with giving for their transgression their first-born, the fruit of their bodies for the sin of their souls^e. Even these costly offerings they deem themselves too unworthy to present in person, and seek for a Priest to offer them on their behalf, and to pray for and

^d 1 John iii. 9, 10.

^e Micah vi. 7.

instead of them; in a word, for a Mediator who will pass between them and their gods, and will reconcile and bring to one mind (make *atonement* between) these alienated parties. We learn from the Apostle Paul^f, that in the heathen empire in which he lived, there were supposed to be *in heaven and in earth gods many and lords*, that is, mediators, *many*; but to us, he adds, *there is but one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him.* The high priest after the order of Aaron, shadowed forth in his twofold capacity of sacrificer and intercessor, (that is, as far as could be done by one who had to offer *first for his own sins*, and who could not *continue by reason of death*,) *this Minister of the true Tabernacle, this Mediator of a better covenant, who once at the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, after which by his own blood he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption^g.* His Priesthood does not, like that of Aaron, pass on in succession to other individuals, because *he is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life^h.* *He ever liveth to make intercession, and therefore he, and he aloneⁱ, can save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him, being the new and living way, through whom alone we have access to his Father.* What sinner is there who ought not to rejoice and be satisfied with such an Intercessor, who possesses for his office all the power and all the willingness that we can desire or conceive? And what child of Adam has there ever been who has not sinned? How strange it is then, and were it not a fact continually occurring, it would seem incredible, that on the one hand the proud Deist, relying on his presumed innocence, should present himself to the holy heart-searching God, without any mediator; and that on the other, there should be Christians,

^f 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

^g Heb. ix.

^h Heb. vii. 16.

ⁱ Heb. vii. 25.

who, distrusting the willingness of him who has promised, that he will not cast out any that come to him, seek, like the Gentiles, for mediators of their own discovery, angels and departed saints. They forget that the former are incapable of *being touched*, like their and our Lord, experimentally with *our infirmities*, and however excellent, are but our *fellow servants*; and that the latter, being themselves debtors to Grace alone for their own salvation, *cannot redeem a brother's soul, but must leave that alone for ever*. This *humidity*, which declines to accept the Saviour's invitation, and goes to inferior mediators for an introduction into his presence, who has promised to be gracious to his people, and when he hears their cry, to answer^k, may be specious, but we know from an Apostle that it is *false*; for St. Paul warns the Colossians¹ not to be *beguiled with enticing words*, and so to be deprived of their reward by worshipping of Angels; and it is remarkable, that this error had been so rooted in that neighbourhood, that it was decreed at the Council of Laodicea, as late as the fourth century, that whoever invoked them had *not kept the Head*, but had forsaken the Son of God, and gone over to idolatry. Nevertheless, the modern Church of Rome maintains, that the Saints ought to be worshipped, and that other believers should flee to them for help, because they now reign together with Christ, and offer up prayers for them. Under the latter clause, direct prayers for temporal and eternal blessings have been and are addressed to them by the highest authorities in that Church, that is, by those who have been since canonized, and by Popes, including the present; but such prayers are generally kept out of sight in discussions with Protestants; and they endeavour to turn aside the force of our arguments by asserting, that they only pray to the Saints to pray to our Advocate in heaven for us. *There is one Mediator between God and man*, is so decisive

^k Isaiah xxx. 18, 19.

¹ Colossians ii.

a text, that it requires ingenuity to evade its force. Consequently a nice distinction has been invented between Mediation of Redemption, and Mediation of Intercession. The former, they allow, is the exclusive province of the *Man Christ Jesus*^m; but they require secondary Mediators to make him through their merits gracious to ordinary believers; and too many of them, practically as well as in theory, derogate from the glory both of the Son and of the Father, by addressing prayer almost wholly to his departed servants, especially his Virgin Mother. According to the confession of writers of their own communion, some of them feel more attached to the Saints than to their Lord, and put more trust in the intercession of such of them as they have chosen for patrons, than in that of Christ himself. The lofty titles of the Virgin—Refuge of sinners, Queen, even of the Apostles and Angels, and above all Mother of mercy, so called, we are told, because, while the Son kept to himself the administration of justice, he assigned to her the gracious portion of his power—virtually depose him, and the request to her to exercise her maternal authority in their behalf, treats his mediation for these less as a favour than as their right. Even this inferior mediation practically supersedes the higher, which he is continually offering to his Father. For without proceeding to the blasphemous excess which would interpose the Virgin or St. Francis as a shield to protect them from the darts of the angry and threateningⁿ Son of God, the plea that they

^m See Bishop Bull's *Vindication of the Church of England, and Corruptions of the Church of Rome*, and Archbishop Tillotson's *Sermons on the Doctrine of Mediators*.

ⁿ The Book of the Conformities of St. Francis to Jesus Christ, amounting to forty, the composition of a devoted Franciscan Friar, was sanctioned by the Order, at a Chapter meeting at Assisi, A.D. 1399. Their Founder appears therein not only as far superior to all other Saints, but even as the equal of Christ, the efficacy of whose

apply to Saints because they are so merciful, indirectly at least lowers in their estimation the mercy of their compassionate High Priest. To those who are jealous of their Redeemer's honour, and would ascribe their salvation exclusively to him, no Roman Catholic tenet is more offensive. None happily is more easily confuted, for it is so recent a practice, that Liturgies are extant, in which prayer is offered *for* the Virgin and the Saints, instead of *to* them, as in the present Mass; the very foundation of the doctrine, their reigning with Christ, is removed, if contrary to the decrees of Roman Councils we interpret Scripture with the early writers of the Church, and maintain, that though enjoying greater happiness than we can as yet conceive in the place of departed spirits, they will not till after the final judgment be admitted into the presence of God in heaven. Even conceding that they enjoy already the beatific vision, it will be impossible to extricate this tenet from the difficulties in which it is involved, for the faculties of the *spirits of just men made perfect* are still limited so that they cannot hear the prayers of their worshippers on earth, except in as far as it pleases God to show it to them (as explained, if we may use that term, by the Schoolmen) in the mirror of the Trinity. Such a theory confutes

sufferings he has completed by his own. I should not have referred to this undue exaltation of a mortal, if it had been limited to ■ barbarous age, but the forty points of resemblance were enlarged by a Spanish Franciscan to four thousand: *Prodigiosum naturæ et gratiæ portentum*: Madrid 1631: and the original work was reprinted at Cologne, 1632, and vindicated against the attacks of the Reformers. Even a painter, as recent as Rubens, has represented this Saint as throwing the skirt of his friar's gown over the world, represented as a globe, to protect it from a thunderbolt, hurled from heaven by Jesus! thus transferring his special office to this enthusiast. The picture, which was in the unique collection of the Louvre, was after the peace restored to the Church at Antwerp, for which it was painted.

itself, since it assumes, that before they can mediate with God, he must make known to them for whom and why they are to mediate. Prayer then to such imaginary mediators is useless: but it is worse, it must be sinful; for *the Lord, whose name is jealous*, will allow no created being to share in any degree the *glory due unto his name* alone. Even St. John^o, for only falling down at the feet of the Angel who had shown him future events, was reproved by him for this act of homage, because he was but *the fellow-servant*, not of the Apostle alone, but of all *them which keep the sayings of that Book*. And are not all angels, asks an Apostle, *ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation*^p? A mediator must possess some qualification to justify his assuming the office, and this St. Paul proceeds to tell us is possessed by our one Mediator, *who gave himself a ransom for all*; having found what the Psalmist^q says, man cannot do for his brother, but must *let alone for ever, the redemption of his soul*; and this ransom is his life, a ransom which could be only found by one in whom, not being “naturally engendered of Adam,” as St. John says, there was not sin^r. Thus Christ has by his death purchased his people to be his peculiar property, and redeemed them out of the power of Satan, by whom they had been led captive. Our Mediator is therefore entitled to be called not only our Saviour and Preserver, but also our Redeemer; and that title has a fuller meaning than is known to many, who are not acquainted with the original language of the Old Testament, in which it is used much oftener than in the New^s. A Redeemer, as equivalent to a Purchaser, is familiar to all:

^o Rev. xii. 8. ^p Heb. i. 14. ^q Ps. xlv. ^r Art. ix. xv.

^s For the nature of the office of the Göel, see Michaelis's Commentary on the Mosaic Law, ii. 10. and a valuable Sermon upon Jehovah our Redeemer, preached before the University of Oxford, by the Rev. Robert Gandell, M.A. of Queen's College.

but it is comparatively unknown as answering to the Hebrew *Goel*, which no single word in modern tongues can express, but is rendered in Ruth^s in its primary sense, *a near kinsman*, in Deuteronomy^t, *avenger of blood*, and in Leviticus^u and in Job^x, *redeemer*. An examination of it would remove one of the chief scruples of enquiring Israelites, and convince them that the Messiah, to whom it preeminently belongs, while *he took on him the seed of Abraham*, was also the *most high God*. This office was not created, but regulated by the Mosaic Law, and in the important article of revenge restricted, by providing cities in which those who had slain men, might find refuge from this *blood avenger*. The Goel was the nearest kinsman; and in an early stage of society, when the law is feeble, its want of power is supplied in many countries by the strength of family attachment. Among the Israelites, we find that the Goel came forward not only as an avenger of the dead, but as the protector and vindicator of the rights and interests of the living; for it was his duty also to redeem the alienated inheritance of a relation, and under certain circumstances, to marry the nearest of kin. Such obligations were acknowledged as early as in the time of Job^y, for he claims the eternal God for his near kinsman; *I know*, he exclaims, *that my Redeemer*, or Vindicator, [Goeli] *liveth*; and that he means not the Father but the Son is evident, for in faith he looked to that *brother born for adversity*, who would destroy him who had the power of death, by restoring to men their forfeited lives, whom he should *see for himself with his own eyes in the flesh*, when he should stand at the latter day upon the earth. Such a Redeemer undertook the office as the promised Seed of the woman, but the accomplishment of what he undertook, required union with the Deity; and Isaiah^z assures us, that Jehovah Sabaoth, that is, *the Lord of Hosts*, meaning

^s Ruth iii. 9, 12.^t Deut. xix. 6.^u Leviticus xxv. 25.^x Job xix. 25.^y Job xix. 23—27.^z Is. xlvi. 4.

the self-existing Creator and Governor of the universe, *is his name*. The declaration of such a hope fully justifies the Patriarch's wish, that it were *graven in the rock for ever*; and indeed it would be an appropriate inscription in any age, over the entrance of the sepulchre of those who fall asleep in the expectation of a blessed resurrection. Our Redeemer, thus entitled to be our Mediator, now in anticipation of his approaching sacrifice, pleaded its merit with his Father, and finished his ministry with an intercession, which, for the encouragement and consolation of all who should hereafter believe in his name, and who were even then the objects of his solicitude, he graciously uttered aloud.

As the typical high priest, after the order of Aaron, was required^a to offer annual intercession and sacrifice for himself, the priests, and the whole nation; so our real High Priest, on his day of atonement, performed both parts of his office; interceding and consecrating himself as the victim. While he supplicated as the Mediator, *the Man Christ Jesus*, he spoke also with the majesty of *the Son of God*; and though upon the point of meeting a cruel and ignominious death, there is no mention of approaching sufferings; but his mind is solely intent upon the great work given him to do, the salvation of men. Our High Priest prayed first for himself^b, then for his immediate followers^c, and finally for all who should hereafter believe on him through their word. His prayer was heard as respected himself, for the Father straightway glorified him both in heaven and on earth; on earth, by the prodigies attending his crucifixion, by the conversion of the penitent thief, and by the testimony borne to him by Pilate and the Centurion: in heaven, by his ascension and exaltation to the mediatorial throne, *angels, principalities, and powers being made subject to him*. And the Son glorified the Father, in magnifying his law and

^a Levit. xvi. 17.

^b John xvii. 1—5.

^c John xvii. 6—19.

righteous government, in his own humiliation, and in the glory that followed it. His prayer was also granted for the unanimity and success of his first disciples, and is granted from age to age, more or less abundantly, according to the zeal and exertions of believers of successive generations. *I pray for them*, he added, *I pray not for the world*. He prayed first for himself, that is, as he had glorified his Father upon earth, and finished the work assigned to him, by making known to as many as had been given him the doctrine that leadeth to eternal life, that is, the knowledge of the only true God, and of him whom he had sent, so he would in return glorify him with the original glory which he had enjoyed in his immediate presence before the foundation of the world. He then prayed for his Apostles, because they had been given unto him and had been faithful, that God would preserve them in his name, that is, in the true religion, and protect them from the evil world, which would hate them as they were not of it. As he should be no longer with them, he prayed likewise his Father to sanctify or consecrate them by and for the truth, as he had consecrated himself for their sake. The term in reference to himself must mean consecration to his office, because of increase of moral sanctification, he was incapable, being already perfect in holiness. His intercession was only for his people, but it was not limited to his personal followers; for he proceeded to pray for all who should hereafter through their teaching believe, and his prayer is, that they all may be united into one body by the closest union with his Father and with one another, and be one, even as his Father and himself are, that is, in mind, affections, and desires; and this he asked, not for their good alone, but that this edifying spectacle of unanimity and brotherly affection might convince the world that he had come forth from God. He concluded with expressing a desire, that all who had been given to him might be with

him, that they might behold his glory, and share both in it, and in his and his Father's love.

Jesus, in saying, *I pray not for the world*, could not mean that he would never pray for his adversaries, for this would be inconsistent with his command, *Pray for them that despitefully use you*^d, and his practice, for it was actually done by him on the cross; but the nature of the case did not permit his praying for the opposers of his religion, in the sense in which he prayed for his disciples, that is, for their concord and perseverance, though he indirectly prayed for them in praying for the success of his Apostles. The main object too of his prayer is for his disciples, not so much as *individuals*, but as *apostles*: not so much for their personal benefit, as for the propagation, through them, of the truth.

The subject of this prayer, the unity of Christians, and the reason assigned for it, the conversion of the world, casts the strongest light on the guilt of schism. It ought consequently to be considered with self-examination, and with supplication for guidance into the whole truth, by all who separate from any branch of Christ's Catholic and Apostolic Church, since separation can only be justified by the departure of that Church, as in the instance of the Roman, from some essential article of faith. It ought likewise to warn the authorities of any Church not to press as indispensable any article of minor importance, lest they should thereby keep from union with them, some that love, no less than themselves, *our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity*. Happily, all who intelligently believe *in the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent*, can conscientiously unite in the confession, prayers, and thanksgivings of our reformed branch of it, and repeat the ancient Creeds which we retain, because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture^e." Christianity is here defined by him who is the Author of it, to consist in the knowledge of the only

^d Matt. v. 44.

^e Art. viii.

true God, and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent; that is, that Jehovah is the true God, in opposition to the gods many of the Gentiles; and that Jesus is the Apostle of God, the true Christ, in opposition to the false Christs who would lay claim to the office. He revealed the only true God, not as he is in essence dwelling in unapproachable light, but in his moral character as holy and just as well as merciful, and as such devising and decreeing man's salvation, and himself as the Lord sent into the world to accomplish it. Such knowledge is eternal life, for it will be practical, and lead to the due worship of the Son as well as of the Father.

129. Our Saviour's Agony. *Matt. xxvi. 30—46. Mark xiv. 32—42. Luke xxii. 39—46. John xviii. 1.*

THE ministry of Jesus was now finished. For three years he had publicly condemned sin, while he encouraged the penitent sinner. He had taught morality and religion in the Synagogue and in the Temple, and had attested by signs of every description the reality of his mission and the truth of his doctrine. His ministry finished, he had instituted a memorial of his death for the benefit of his people; and comforted, instructed, and prayed for his Apostles, and all who should hereafter believe in him. All that now remained for him to do was to pray for himself; and that he might pray without interruption, he now led out the Eleven over the Cedron to Gethsemane, a hamlet between the town and the Mount of Olives, and entered with them into a garden which they were accustomed to frequent, so that Judas would know where to find him. Here he intended to wait for *the son of perdition*, and to prepare himself for his approaching sufferings by prayer. Leaving the others at the entrance, he took with him, to witness his distress of mind, only the three who had been favoured with a sight of his glory on the mountain of Transfiguration, and withdrew about a stone's throw even from them. This agony or

struggle of mind, between the sense of Divine abandonment and the desire of enduring it for man's sake, is one of the profound mysteries that we are unable to comprehend: and this is well acknowledged by the Greek Church, which, pleading with the Saviour his own merits, conjures him to aid his worshippers, among other appeals, by his incomprehensible agony. We also in our Litany conjure this "good Lord" to have mercy upon us, "by his agony and bloody sweat;" and one reason of his enduring it seems intimated by the Apostle, that from his sufferings on this and other occasions, we might have assurance that he is *touched with the feelings of our infirmities*. Incomprehensible as, in some respects, this agony must continue to us, it will, notwithstanding, be profitable to meditate upon it with the light cast upon it by the word of God. Many of Christ's followers in different ages have encountered the severest sufferings, and even the most cruel death, in his cause, not merely with composure, but even with joy; and no one will presume to draw a comparison of excellence between the Saviour and the very best of them. We must consequently conclude, that there were some bitter ingredients in his cup which were not in theirs, and some cordial infused into theirs which was denied to him. And yet from his mental agony, we must exclude the two that it should seem would cause the severest pangs—Remorse and Despair. We are told, in the memorable prophecy of Isaiah^f, that *it pleased the Lord to bruise him*: and this declaration suggests the explanation of the difficulty. The support of the Holy Spirit purchased by his sufferings for his people, was withheld from himself. His human nature, though enabled by its union with the Deity to endure his inconceivable anguish without sinking under it, was left destitute of all consolatory communication. He must have had the clearest perception of the *exceeding sinfulness*, and what expiation it required;

^f Isaiah liii. 10.

and he must have felt more exquisitely than any inferior being, the hiding of God's countenance, in whose favour alone there can be happiness or even tranquillity for a soul that is able to appreciate it. Without presuming to speculate farther, we may be sure that the Saviour underwent as much misery as was compatible with a pure conscience, perfect virtue, and the knowledge that his sufferings would terminate in a complete victory over the spiritual enemy; and we may affirm with truth, that there *never was a sorrow like unto his sorrow^g.* This mysterious narrative shows, that human nature, even in its perfect state, is averse from suffering; and we learn from it, that we may innocently pray to be delivered from calamities, provided we are disposed to bear them patiently, if God's better wisdom should assign them to us. *He suffered*, says the Apostle to the Hebrews^h, *being tempted*; nor does it seem improbable that the great enemy of man, after having been foiled in his seductive trials in the wilderness, might now have assaulted our Saviour with terrific temptations, in the hope of deterring him from the work which he had undertaken. Jesus appears in the garden as preeminently *the Man of sorrows*. His *soul was full of heaviness, and disquieted within him*; and the Psalmist's prediction was now verified, *the snares of death compassed me round about, and the pains of hell gat hold upon me*. He is described as *sore amazed and very heavy* (*ἀδημονεῖν*); that is, perplexed and without resource. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death*: and so violent was the conflict, that *there appeared unto him an Angel from heaven strengthening him*; and from this, we may perhaps infer, that he was now exposed, not as before to the allurements, but to the *fiery darts of the wicked one*. His agony produced a bloody sweat, and that in the open air, and in a night so unusually cold, that others needed a fire

^g Lam. i. 12.

^h Heb. ii. 18.

to warm themⁱ. The expression is explained by some of the size, not of the nature, of the drops^k; yet there is no physical reason why we should not take it literally, for bloody sweats have been recorded by physicians and historians^l. Jesus prayed three times that this cup might pass from him, but still with the reservation, *if it were possible*; and concluded each time with perfect resignation, *Not my will, but thine be done*. What was this Cup? In the opinion of most, the painful and ignominious death he was about to undergo; but others say, the agony now endured: and this seems to be more in harmony with the Messiah's character and office, for he had before said, that for this very purpose he had come to this hour; and it appears to be confirmed by the Apostle's declaration^m, that *he was heard* on account of his piety, or delivered from what *he feared*; for he was delivered not from dying, but from the distress of mind, which dictated to him, *in the days of his flesh, prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears*. And on rising up from prayer, he became calm and composed, going forward to meet the approaching danger with entire self-possession. *Rise, let us be going; behold, he is at hand that delivers me up*. After this agony was over, remonstrating against Peter's interference to rescue him from the guard, he said, *The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?* meaning then by *the cup*, as appears from the context, his being lifted up upon the Cross. His composure never again left him, as appears from the minute accounts

ⁱ John xviii. 18.

^k On account of the particle, *ωσει*, *as it were*, used also of the Dove at his baptism. St. Luke iii. 22.

^l The possibility of it is proved by the fatal disease of Charles the Ninth of France, who was even bathed in his own blood, which oozed out of the pores of his skin. Wraxall's History of the Kings of France of the Race of Valois, vol. ii. p. 278.

^m Heb. v. 7.

of his Trial and Crucifixion, unless it were the exclamation on the Cross; but that being a citation from a Psalm, might be intended to direct the by-standers to the many predictions in it of the Messiah, and to express at the utmost not his own feelings, but only the fact that he was forsaken.

Great as his sorrow was, it did not absorb him, for he enjoined three of the disciples, and Peter by name, who instead of watching had fallen asleep, to pray also for themselves, telling them that prayer and watchfulness were the best preservative from temptation. *The spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak;* not saying this to excuse the past, but to warn them for the future, that this neglect of duty would leave them defenceless in the hour of temptation, and that they would fall, notwithstanding their wish and determination to stand. Peter's self-confidence, almost immediately after, induced him, notwithstanding this warning, to enter into temptation, by going into the court of the high priest's palace, and so made way for his fall. Twice did Christ find his Apostles asleep, and this sleepiness, though the hour might be late, it is difficult to understand: Luke says, it was produced by sorrow.

130. *Jesus is delivered up by Judas.* Matt. xxvi. 47—54. Mark xiv. 41—52. Luke xxii. 48—53. John xviii. 4—16.

Jesus having finished his acts of devotion, told them that his arrest was at hand, and that their opportunity of watching and praying had been lost. While yet speaking, Judas entered with a multitude, armed with swords and clubsⁿ, being chiefly the servants of the chief priests, and with them a detachment of Roman soldiers. He was not seized by force, but surrendered of his free will, asking of his own accord whom they sought, and stipulating that his disciples should be permitted to retire without molestation. He was obliged to repeat his enquiry, and they do not seem to

ⁿ ξύλων, not ράβδων, staves, A. T.

have ventured to approach him, till the *son of perdition* gave them the preconcerted sign, and betrayed his Master with a kiss. The majesty of his appearance so overawed them, that when he replied, *I am he*, they not only drew back, but fell to the ground; attempting no violence against the Eleven, not even against Peter, though he had, without waiting for leave, drawn his sword, and cut off the ear of Malchus, the high priest's servant, who probably had come prominently forward. Jesus, showing at once his prudence and composure, and acting upon his own maxim of doing good to his enemies, asked the guard to suffer him to approach the sufferer. He then touched and miraculously restored the servant's ear, protesting at the same time against his disciples resisting the magistrate or his officers; for so we must limit the prohibition of using the sword. He told Peter, he did not need his feeble arm to rescue him, for if he chose to decline his voluntary sufferings, and yield to the temptation, he might have commanded instead of twelve men, the service of twelve legions of Angels; of more, we may say, than seventy thousand beings that *excel in strength*, who would readily "speed to do his bidding;" one of whom would have been irresistible by an army of mortals. The Eleven took to flight, no attempt being made to detain any of them; so that, as St. John reminds us, our Saviour's late declaration in his prayer was literally accomplished, *Of those which thou gavest me, I have lost none.*

Mark alone informs us, that a young man (*γεανίσκος*) followed, clothed only with a linen wrapper, who perhaps had been roused from sleep, and that the soldiers (*γεανίσκοι*) laying hold of him, he left it in their hands, and escaped. One tradition reports him to have been St. John, or another Apostle; but they had all fled before. Some conjecture that he was the owner of the garden, or the master of the house where they had eaten the passover. The Greek noun in a secondary sense, had obtained the meaning of

persons that served; thus it is applied to the young men who carried Sapphira to her grave^o, and was frequently used of soldiers. At all events, we may presume that he was a disciple.

131. *He is brought before Annas, who sends him immediately to Caiaphas, the high priest. Peter, as foretold, denies his Master thrice. Matt. xxvi. 57—75. Mark xiv. 66—72. Luke xxii. 54—62. John xviii. 15—27.*

Jesus being bound at the Traitor's suggestion, for fear of his escaping, was taken in the first instance to the house of Annas, who had been high priest for fourteen years, but had been deposed about nine by the Romans. Such was his influence, notwithstanding he had been so long displaced, that he was consulted as to their future proceedings; nor will this surprise us, when informed that he had been succeeded in order by no less than five of his sons, and several of his sons in-law, one of whom, Joseph, surnamed Caiaphas, now held the office. The scheme of apprehending our Lord seems to have originated with him: certainly he had recommended to the Council the putting him to death, on the ground of expediency. And St. John records his speech, in part it may be to show that the judge was pre-determined to condemn the prisoner, as he stated, for the benefit of the nation. Annas, without examining Jesus, sent him, bound as he was, to this high priest, his son-in-law. Peter and another disciple, thought to be John, recovering from their panic, followed afar off; and, as the latter was known to the high priest, they obtained admission into the court, from which they might see what was going on in the open council-room above. This was another false step, for, by striking Malchus, Peter had rendered himself more obnoxious than the rest; and as he had not courage to own his Master, he ought not to have rushed into this

^o. Acts v. 11.

temptation. The young woman who kept the door, seeing Peter warming himself at the fire, challenged him with being a follower of Jesus; and the dread of detection, especially as he had heard his Master interrogated respecting his disciples, made him break his resolution and promise. He denied him, and went out into the porch, in order to escape notice; and here the first crowing of the cock reminded him of his Master's prediction. Still, however, fear prevailed; he a second time denied him, to the same and to others^p; and when, about an hour after, a relation of Malchus declared that he had seen him in the garden, and the bystanders observed, that his Galilean pronunciation confirmed the charge, he denied with an oath, cursing himself if he had any knowledge of Jesus, adding perjury to falsehood. Immediately, while he was yet speaking, the cock crew again, and Jesus turning round, looked upon Peter. This look softened his heart, and brought him to a godly sorrow, so that *when he thought upon his Lord's prediction of his fall, he wept bitterly*^q. The fact is recorded by all the

^p According to Matthew, he was asked the second time by another maid. Mark's phrase is ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν πάλιν, which our translators render "a maid saw him again," as if it had been *τις*, a sense which, according to Grotius, the words may bear. But though Peter only denied thrice, he might be questioned oftener; and it seems better to translate ἡ παιδίσκη, *the maid*, that is, the one that kept the door, and to suppose with Matthew that there was another; and with Luke, a man, *ἔτερος*, and with John, several, *ἔτεροι*, who interrogate him the second time.

^q *He rushed out.* Beza.

Throwing his garment over his head. Macknight.

He began to weep. Vulg. Syr.

He continued to weep. Simon Leclerk.

Such are the various ways of translating *Ἐπιβαλὼν*, Mark xiv. 72. but that of our Version, *thought thereon*, is probably the best, though it offers us in the margin the choice of *wept abundantly*, and *began to weep*.

Evangelists, and the time of these denials was the space of the third Roman watch, or from midnight to three o'clock in the morning, which was called the cock-crowing. And if John, as we may presume, remained, it was arranged by Divine Providence, that one of our Lord's biographers should be an eyewitness of his trial before the Council.

132. *Jesus, on his Trial, adjured by the High Priest, acknowledges himself to be the Messiah, and is condemned as guilty of death. Matt. xxvi. 63—75. Mark xiv. 53—65. Luke xxii. 60—70. John xviii. 19—31.*

It was not till day-break that the Council and the witnesses could be brought together to the palace, and in the interval the high priest examined Jesus concerning his disciples and his doctrine, hoping to be enabled to condemn him out of his own mouth. He objected to this unjust mode of examination, and replied, that he had ever spoken openly to the world, in the synagogue and in the temple, and desired him to interrogate those that had heard him. The answer was deemed disrespectful, and one of the officers that stood by smote him with the palm of his hand. He expostulated, meekly replying, *If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?* thus becoming an example of his own precept^r, to bear with patience a sudden and unprovoked injury; an example rarely imitated by his disciples, and remarkably contrasted by St. Paul's reproof of the high priest, under a similar trial.

Wishing to preserve the semblance of justice, the Council being assembled sought out witnesses to charge him with a capital crime; but though many were produced, none could be found whose accusations were consistent; and in order to condemn a person to death, the Law required two. It was also necessary to produce such evidence as would satisfy

^r Matt. v. 44.

the Roman Governor. At last two came, and all that these could advance was a perversion of his words, when he purified the Temple at the commencement of his ministry. No charge could be brought forward for the three following years, though he had constantly taught in public, and had been watched by enemies, anxious to catch words out of his mouth for his accusation; and even these witnesses did not agree in their story. The high priest then questioned Jesus, hoping he might say something that would condemn himself; but he only answered, *If I tell you ye will not believe; and if I ask [your opinion of me], you will not answer me, nor let me go.* The high priest, every other hope of criminating him being frustrated, then adjured him by the living God; and being thus put upon his oath, he felt himself bound to break silence, and declare himself the Messiah. His answer in our translation is ambiguous. Matthew renders it, *Thou hast said.* Luke, *Ye say that I am.* But the ambiguity in the latter arises from the translation of the question, *Art thou then the Son of God?* which ought to have been rendered, *Thou art then the Son of God?* Mark gives it without any circumlocution, *I am,* and no doubt could have been entertained of his meaning, for he proceeded to assure his judges of the truth of his affirmation, and that they should in due time have proof of it, referring them to the fulfilment of two prophecies, which they themselves applied to the Messiah. *Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God^s,* as announced by David; *ye shall see the sign ye have so often demanded, foretold by Daniel^t, the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven.* This declaration was exactly what they sought; and it having been decided, that Jesus was by his own reply guilty of blasphemy, (a capital offence,) they condemned him to death, observing that there was no further need of witnesses, since they had the prisoner's own confes-

^s Ps. cx. 1.

^t Daniel vii. 13, 14.

sion. As soon as it was fully light, (perhaps about four o'clock,) they took him to the Governor, without whose consent they had no power to enforce their sentence. First, however, did they (that is, some of the council as well as the attendants) spit in his face, buffet and mock him, blindfolding his eyes, and saying, *Divine, thou Messiah, who it is that smote thee!* while others struck him with their fists, or with the palm of their hands.

Thus they fulfilled unconsciously predictions, the literal accomplishment of which, in a person of such dignity as the Messiah, seemed impossible. But

*He was wounded for our transgressions,
He was bruised for our iniquities^u.
The chastisement of our peace was upon him,
And with his stripes we are healed.
His visage was so marred, more than any man,
And his form more than the sons of men^x.
I gave my back to the smiters,
And my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair;
I hid not my face from shame and spitting^y.
He was oppressed and he was afflicted,
Yet he opened not his mouth^z.*

The minutest circumstances of this trial, and they too improbable to have been expected, have been so graphically delineated by the Psalmist and the Prophet, centuries before they took place, that they have the air of past history, rather than of the prediction of the future. In like manner the substance of the annals of the Greek kings of Syria and Egypt had been so clearly revealed by Daniel long before the Macedonian conquest of the East, that Porphyry maintained his prophecies to be the forgery of a subsequent age; but his assertion, plausible as it might seem to the uninformed, was confuted by the simple fact, that the original work might be seen in the synagogues, and that the Greek

^u Isa. liii. 5.

^x lii. 14.

^y l. 6.

^z liii. 7.

translations of it was in circulation before the birth of most of those kings. To any similar objector of modern times we may give the same unanswerable reply, with this addition, that these predictions, incorporated into the Jewish worship long before Christ, have been ever since his death preserved with care and reverence by the nation wherever dispersed, which, in its unconverted state, is of necessity the antagonist of Christianity, and we may fairly conclude from the strained interpretation of their Rabbis, would have been better pleased if they had never been recorded. We are struck the more, when we consider that we have not the prediction of a single prophet, but that we find we have to collect from several the particulars of the trial, crucifixion, death, and burial of this rejected *Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews*, the Lord of David, as well as his Son and heir after the flesh. Some of the following passages have been referred to him by the Evangelists, and their narratives enable us to apply to him the rest. These citations begin with,

He was numbered among the transgressors^a.

We did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted^b.

He was cut off out of the land of the living^c.

They proceed to,

I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint^d.

My strength is dried up like a potsher^e,

And my tongue cleaveth to my gums;

And thou hast brought me into the dust of death;

For dogs have compassed me^f.

The assembly of the wicked have inclosed me.

They pierced my hands and my feet:

They part my garments (cloak) among them^g,

And cast lots upon my vesture [coat^h].

^a Isaiah liii. 12.

^b ver. 4.

^c ver. 8.

^d Ps. xxii. 14.

^e ver. 15.

^f ver. 16.

^g ver. 18.

^h Ps. lxix. 20.

*Thy rebuke hath broken my heart.
I looked for some to have pity on me,
But there was no man.
They gave me also gall for my meat^k,
And in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.*

And they terminate with the opening of the twenty-second Psalm, (from which I have transcribed so many verses,) to which the dying Saviour drew the attention of those who surrounded his cross.

*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?
And with his last words, from the thirty-first Psalm^l,
Into thy hands I commend my Spirit,
which the Psalmist concludes with,*

Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of Truth.

Such a coincidence between prophecy and its fulfilment, which the Providence of the Deity alone could have effected, ought to silence and convince the sceptic; and it is yet more amazing when we consider, that several of these verses could only have been fulfilled through the co-operation of enemies. Such enemies, however, as *the chief priests, with the scribes and elders*, could not have been ignorant of the words, which the Psalmist had, as it were, prepared for them a thousand years before; and used them, I conceive, to heighten their mockery of his claiming the Messiah's office:

*All they that see me laugh me to scorn:
They shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying,
He trusted in Jehovah that he would deliver him,
Let him deliver him, if he will have him^m, seeing he delighted in him.*

Be this, however, as it may, God's Providence, without interfering with their free agency, overruled their malice to

^k Psalm lxix. 21.

^l Psalm xxxi. 5.

^m If he will have him, Matt. xxvii. 43.

the literal fulfilment of his word. This predicted history of our Redeemer not only extends beyond his death :

*Many are the afflictions of the righteous,
But Jehovah delivereth him out of all.
He keepeth all his bones, not one of them is brokenⁿ;
Because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in
his mouth.*

It reaches to his honourable interment :

*He was with the rich in his death, and made his grave with
the wicked^o.*

*They shall look on me (Jehovah) whom they have pierced^p.
Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,*

Neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption^q.

And even to his glorious resurrection from the grave, and triumphant ascension into heaven :

*Thou hast ascended on high,
Thou hast led captivity captive,
Thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also,
That the Lord God might dwell among them^r.*

Thus was the Judge of the world placed at the bar of his own creatures, falsely accused, unjustly condemned, and barbarously insulted. Yet, because it was agreeable to the end of his coming, he patiently submitted ; such was the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, and constrained him to become obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross !

133. *He is brought before Pontius Pilate the Governor.*

Matt. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii. John xviii.

Jesus having been rejected, and even condemned as a blasphemer, the whole Council, to give the greater weight to their accusation, brought him bound to Pontius Pilatus, the Procurator or Governor, subordinate to the Legate of

ⁿ Psalm xxxiv. 19, 20.

^o Isaiah liii. 9.

^p Zech. xii. 10.

^q Psalm xvi. 10.

^r Psalm lxviii. 18.

Syria. They had no scruple in seeking the death-warrant of an innocent person at an holy season, yet they would not pollute themselves by entering the palace of an heathen, as such pollution would prevent their eating the Passover that evening. Pilate therefore came out to them on a contiguous platform, called in their language, from its elevation, Gabbatha, and in Greek, from its mosaic tessellated flooring, Λιθόστρωτον, the Pavement.

It was very early, yet the Governor, who was no doubt aware of their proceedings, was ready to receive them. He had been in his office six years, and though he had never seen Jesus, who appears not to have visited Cæsarea, the seat of Government, he could not have failed to have heard of his teaching and of his miracles. He wished to decline interfering with one whom he could not see brought before him for judgment without uneasiness; and his manner must have betrayed his reluctance, for to his reasonable question, *what accusation bring ye against this man?* they answered apparently in anger, *if he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee. Take ye him, and judge him according to your law,* was his reply; and it intimated that he was not charged with a capital offence. This they indirectly contradicted by saying, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death;* thus unwittingly bringing about our Lord's own prediction, that he should die not by stoning, the Jewish mode of execution, but by crucifixion, the Roman; a fact which manifested to the whole empire that the Shiloh, to whom the sovereignty belonged, had been already sent, and that the Sceptre and the Lawgiver had departed from Judah. Meanwhile *as a sheep before her shearers is dumb,* so the true King of Israel *opened not his mouth,* to the Governor's amazement. His enemies, knowing that Pilate would disregard the charge of Blasphemy, *as one of the questions of their own superstition,* accused him of Treason against the master whom he represented. *We found him*

perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King. Pilate could refuse no longer without personal risk. He accordingly interrogated the prisoner, saying, *Thou art the King of the Jews?* Jesus being thus called upon by the judge, acknowledged that he had spoken true, but enquired first whether he had enquired of his own accord, or the question had been suggested to him. “The question might either have arisen from a dawning conviction of the truth, like that of Nicodemus; or it might be only an official inquiry, to learn, from the prisoner himself, whether the accusation of the elders was just. Our Lord’s reply is to ascertain, from Pilate’s own lips, the motive of the question. *Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?* Is it from a sincere doubt in thine own mind, the fruit of my miracles, or only as a magistrate, to ascertain my guilt or innocence, that thou makest this inquiry? As afterwards, when St. Paul at Corinth^s was brought before the judgment-seat, and the Proconsul Gallio refused to judge *of words and names, and of the Law*, so now the answer of Pilate disclaimed every thing beyond a judicial purpose. *Am I a Jew? Thine own people and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done?* Do you think that I, a Roman Governor, trouble myself with questions of Jewish superstitions, or have any thought of becoming thy disciple? The chief priests charge thee with stirring up the people against Cæsar. I wish only to know whether thou hast set thyself up for a king. *What hast thou done?* Art thou really guilty, or what hast thou done to give colour to their accusation? The question of Pilate, it is clear, is that of a magistrate. Our Lord makes answer accordingly, and without either denying, or openly asserting that he is King of the Jews, clears himself from the charge of stirring up the people to violence and sedition. *My kingdom is not*

^s Acts xviii.

of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence. The kingdom which I claim does not derive its origin from human policy, or depend for its attainment on the efforts of a party, or on the weapons employed by ambitious men. It is the direct gift of my heavenly Father, and assured to me by his promise. If it were to be secured by seditious measures, my disciples would have fought against the Jews, when they came to take me prisoner by violence. But since I taught them to offer no resistance, and yielded myself at once to my enemies, it is therefore clear that the kingdom which I look for has a higher source, and involves no seditious violence!."

Jesus, in explanation of the sovereignty which he claimed, added, that it was not *out of* this world, οὐχ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. All then are mistaken, who, regarding his Government as similar to the Jewish Theocracy, would either merge the Church in the State, or the State in the Church. The Romanist maintains, that Christ now reigns on earth through a visible Vicegerent, who is directly supreme in all ecclesiastical causes, and paramount over things temporal, whenever they are connected with those that are spiritual. The enthusiastic Anabaptists of Germany, and the Fifth-Monarchy-men of England, while they denounced the Pope, came to the same conclusion; for maintaining that dominion was founded upon grace, they inferred that their Lord's sovereignty, till his return, ought to be administered by his true servants the saints, that is, by themselves. Disgusted with the pretensions of both, too many in modern times run into the opposite extreme, resolving the sovereignty of Christ into a mere spiritual preeminence, and virtually,

* For this and the next quotation I am indebted to Mr. Birk's able work, entitled, "The Christian State, or the first Principles of National Religion."

though unintentionally, dethroning him. Their theory unhappily derives support from the authorized version of our Lord's reply, *My kingdom is not of this world*. *Of* has a double meaning, but there is no ambiguity in 'Ex, for which it stands; and a reference to the original shows that the text is wrested from its meaning, when brought in proof that Christ is not Sovereign of the world. But even the English reader ought not to be so misled for the conclusion of his speech. *Now is my kingdom not from hence*, would supply a key to his meaning. In fact, in both passages, our Lord speaks not of the *nature* but of the *origin* of his sovereignty, saying, that it is not from this world but from above; and elsewhere he uses the same language concerning himself. *I am from above, ye are from beneath: I am not of this world.* Like himself, it is manifested here below, but its origin is, and must be, heavenly. In what proportion his sovereignty should be divided between the Clergy and the Laity, has been frequently disputed; but it is strange that any Christian should deny it, since, in commissioning his Apostles to *teach all nations*, he encouraged them with the assurance, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* Surely it ought not to surprise us, that he to whom *the powers and authorities of heaven have been subject*, should also reign over the race whose nature he has united with his own; and as in reward of his obedience unto death, his Father hath put all things under his feet, how can believers consistently refuse to do him *national* as well as personal homage, when all beings, including expressly those on earth, are required to bow the knee at the name of Jesus. St. John, *in the Spirit on the Lord's day*^u, heard, *Blessing and honour and glory and power, for ever and ever*, from every created intellect, *ascribed to the Lamb that had been slain*; and he afterwards describes Jesus as a Conqueror, *ruling the nations with a rod of iron*^x, under the title of *King of kings*,

^u Rev. v. 12, 13.

^x Rev. xix. 11—16.

and Lord of lords. Write, said this Potentate to the Apostle^y in this vision, to the Angel of the Church of the Laodiceans, that *I am set down with my Father on his throne;* and the whole scope of the Bible, and many express texts, show that our poet justly thus apostrophised *this Son of the Highest,* of whose *kingdom* Gabriel assured his future mother *that there should be no end.*

Come then, and added to thy many crowns,
 Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,
 Thou who alone art worthy! It was thine
 By ancient covenant ere Nature's birth;
 And thou hast made it thine by purchase since.

Cowper's Task, vi. 856.

A misconception of the Saviour's claims upon his people, and their unhappy division into sects under various denominations, who worship apart from one another, render at present popular the opinion, that religion is exclusively a private concern between each man and his Creator; and that, though we are all bound to obey the Lord Jesus Christ as individuals, his authority is not to be recognised by the Legislature or the Government. History has proved, that the visible Church of Christ can exist under an unbelieving ruler; yet every really Christian prince will feel it his duty to regulate his public as well as his private life according to the Bible, and to provide the means for the maintenance of Christian worship. With the solitary modern exception of the United States of America, Christianity is established in every Christian country. The example of Constantine was followed by the barbarians, as soon as they were converted; in all the kingdoms into which the Western Empire was broken up, the nation was divided into the three estates, of clergy, nobles, and commons; and our own most eminent Jurists agree in maintaining, that Christianity is the basis of the British Constitution. The text, properly understood,

^y Rev. iii. 21.

while it is a declaration of Christ's kingdom, is at the same time a definition of its nature; showing that it was not to be enlarged, like earthly sovereignties, by the sword, or maintained by pains and penalties. "The refutation of the charge of treason was complete, and convinced Pilate that Jesus was innocent. Still he could not forbear to ask the meaning of his mysterious answer, but said unto him, *Thou art then a King?* The reply of our Lord is a distinct confession of the great truth. *Thou sayest I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one who is of the truth heareth my voice.* As if he had said, your very question, addressed to a prisoner whose life is in your hands, proves a secret voice in your conscience, which tells you that I am one higher and nobler than my outward appearance would lead you to suppose. My words and actions, you must secretly feel, are those of a King who has veiled his true glory, or you would have no cause to make this enquiry. However scorners may deride the confession in a prisoner on the eve of a shameful death, I do avow myself to be really a King. For I came into the world for this very purpose, to announce, amidst scorn and mockery, that kingdom which my Father has given me, and to call sinners to repent and prepare for the day when it shall be fully revealed. This great truth,—the kingdom of heaven is at hand,—has been the substance of my message; and every one who loves the truth, will obey the warning, and, while he prepares for that kingdom of righteousness, will own me also for the eternal King. Such, very plainly, is the true meaning of this answer of our Lord; and in this manner it is afterwards explained by the Apostle himself^z, when he speaks of this *good confession*, and teaches us that it relates to the *appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which his Father, the blessed and only Potentate, in his times shall show.* The

^z 1 Tim. vi. 13—15.

truth to which he bare witness was not the truth of his doctrine, but of his sovereignty, which he will manifest when he shall come, as he told the high priest, in the clouds of heaven, to make war in righteousness, and to rule the nations with a rod of iron, as King of kings and Lord of lords. He reigns even now, though invisibly and imperfectly, and all mankind are the willing or unwilling instruments to execute his pleasure. And in this kingdom, himself being witness, neutrality is impossible. In public and in private, on the throne and in the cottage, every thought must be brought into captivity to him. His kingdom ought to be the standard of all others, and those subordinate rules best fulfil their office, as they approach nearer to the rules of his. Such an answer, however, was beyond the narrow field of Pilate's vision, and he turned away from this glorious confession with an air of contemptuous unconcern. *Pilate saith unto him, what is Truth?* But though careless about these higher claims, he was well persuaded that the charge of sedition was groundless. He looked on the prisoner, apparently, as an enthusiast, but one whose enthusiasm was quite harmless; for *when he had said this, he went out, and said unto the Jews, I find in him no fault.* He cared nothing about this Utopian kingdom which was to come down from heaven. It was enough that he was satisfied there had been no actual sedition against the Emperor of Rome. But still a deeper impression, though kept down by the pride of a worldly heart, could not be entirely stifled; and when he heard presently the real charge of the Jews, *By our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God,* the fear of surrendering an innocent victim to the popular hatred, is aggravated by an awe, which he could no longer conceal, arising out of the mysterious dignity of this Man of sorrows, and those beams of Divine Majesty which shone out amidst his patient suffering^a."

^a Birk's Christian State.

It is remarkable, that this acknowledgment of sovereignty did not produce upon the Governor the effect that was expected. The philosophy of the Stoics was then so popular at Rome, that it could not have been wholly unknown to any who had received a liberal education. They had proudly pourtrayed an imaginary sage, their model of ideal perfection which they aspired to realise, as inferior to Jupiter only as being a mortal, in other respects as his equal, or rather superior, as the god was described to be wise by nature, the sage by choice. Horace had already in jest summed up his perfections, with the title of King of kings^b: and Pilate having, we may suppose, some notion of these lofty pretensions, might have regarded the king of Israel as a visionary, but harmless, self-styled sovereign. *Every one*, said our Lord in conclusion, *who is of the truth, heareth my voice*. Pilate proved that he was not; for though he asked, *what is Truth?* he would not stay for an answer. The question may be explained in several ways: but it seems to me most natural to suppose, that he meant to say, this is no reason for entering upon a philosophical discussion, I have now to consider the means of saving thy life; for he immediately went out upon the pavement, and publicly declared, that he found no cause to condemn him. They, exasperated, cried out, *he stirreth up the people to rebellion, beginning from Galilee, to this place*. Pilate then questioned him again, but Jesus, having made his *good confession*, gave the Governor no answer.

134. *Pilate, being informed that Jesus is a Galilean, sends him to Herod. Luke xxiii. 6—12.*

The mention of Galilee, however, suggested an expedient, by which he hoped, without exasperating his accusers, to avoid condemning a person whom he believed to be innocent. Finding on enquiry that Jesus was called a Galilean, he

^b Ep. i. 107.

sent him to Herod, the sovereign of that district, whom the passover had brought to Jerusalem. Herod had long desired to see one of whom he had heard such extraordinary reports, and whom he suspected to be the Baptist risen from the grave. He was therefore exceedingly pleased; but as Jesus performed no miracle to gratify him, nor even answered any of his questions, he was disappointed, and despised him. Still, though the priests had followed and urged to Herod, as a Jew, the charge of blasphemy, as they had done that of treason to the Roman Governor, he too did not choose to have any concern in his death, and therefore sent him back to Pilate. Previously, however, he joined his soldiers and officers in coarsely deriding his claim, by clothing him in a royal robe; and this act has been considered by some as equivalent to a declaration of innocence, as he did not substitute for his own dress the black suit of one capitally condemned. Herod and Pilate had been upon bad terms on several accounts. We learn from Luke^c, that the Governor had massacred some Galileans while worshipping in the Temple; and from Philo, that he had placed without leave, in the Tetrarch's palace, some shields which he had dedicated to Tiberius. In this trial before the Rulers of Galilee and Judæa was verified, according to St. Peter^d, a passage in the second Psalm; for in leading the prayer of *their own* then little *company*, when *they lifted up their voice to God with one accord*, he said, referring to it, *Of a truth against thy holy Child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together.* The only result of Pilate's courtesy, was his reconciliation with Herod. Still it afforded him a topic in favour of the Prisoner's innocence; and the Tetrarch's concurrence in his

^c Luke xiii. 1.

^d Acts iv. 25—28.

opinion, that Jesus had done nothing worthy of death^e, had the more weight, from his being a Jew.

135. *Herod sends him back to Pilate, who seeks in vain to release him. Mark xv. 7—9.*

Pilate, having failed in his endeavour to transfer the judgment of Jesus to Herod, again took his seat upon the tribunal, and the reluctance which he felt to pronounce sentence must have been much increased by a message communicated to him from his wife, who charged him to have nothing to do with that just Person, concerning whom she had suffered much in a dream. History has preserved her name, Claudia Procula, but recorded no more of her; and the incident confirms the Evangelist's veracity; for although under the Republic a Governor had not been allowed to take his wife unto his Province, the practice had become common in consequence of Livia's accompanying Augustus, and a proposal to abolish it had been recently unsuccessfully submitted to the Senate^f. It had been the Governor's custom for some years at this feast, to please the populace by releasing whatever prisoner they chose to favour; and Pilate now gave them the option of Jesus or Barabbas, who, besides the very crime of which they accused the former, had been guilty of murder. As Pilate knew that the chief priests had delivered up Jesus from envy, he hoped that the crowd, who had followed him so lately with acclamations of seeming loyalty, would prefer him. He would thus save his life; and the priests would be less irritated if he were not acquitted, but set at liberty

^e Such seems to be the sense of πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ, and it is so translated by Beza; our own version, which agrees with the Vulgate, *nothing worthy of death done unto him*, may mean, he had not been treated by Herod like a person guilty of a capital offence.

^f Tacitus, Annals, iii. 33. Cf. i. 40. ii. 54.

by an act of grace. His scheme failed, for they had sufficient influence over the people, to make them ask for the liberation of Barabbas and the crucifixion of Jesus; and though the third time Pilate declared that he had committed no capital offence, and should be chastised and dismissed, they only cried out the more vehemently, *Crucify him!*

136. *Pilate orders Jesus to be scourged, and, after another fruitless attempt to move the pity of the people and declaring his innocence, reluctantly delivers him to the soldiers to be crucified. John xix. 1—16.*

Pilate now ordered Jesus to be scourged, hoping to appease the fury of the priests, and the populace now united with them, by this cruel and disgraceful punishment. The bodily pain which it inflicted was heightened by the cruel mockery of the whole band, who put on him a purple robe and a crown of thorns, and gave him a reed for a sceptre. They then knelt before him as a sovereign, till, wearied of this assumed deference, they struck him with his mock sceptre, spat on him, and smote him with their hands upon the head^g. Pilate then exhibited him

^g An instance of mockery occurred not long after in the reign of Caligula, which, for its striking similarity to the conduct of the soldiers to our blessed Lord, deserves to be cited. “When Agrippa, who had been appointed to his uncle Philip’s tetrarchy with the right of wearing a crown, came to Alexandria on his way to his new dominions, the inhabitants, among other ways of showing their ill will, brought into the Gymnasium, Carabas, a sort of distracted fellow, who at all seasons went naked about the streets, the common jest of boys and idle people: placed him on a lofty seat, put a papyrus wreath on his head instead of a diadem, gave him for a sceptre a short stick of it picked up from the ground, and dressed him in a mat instead of a robe, χλαμύς. Having thus given him a mimic royal air, several young men with poles on their shoulders acted as his guard; and others did him homage or solicited justice; while

to the people in the garb of royalty, ($\chi\lambda\alpha\mu\upsilon\varsigma$,) and again declared his innocence, saying, *Behold the Man!* Still the chief priests and their attendants persevered in the cry, *Crucify him! crucify him!* Pilate's reply appears to have been ironical, for they dared not take the Governor at his word, but returned to the charge on which the Council had condemned him; *Take ye him, and crucify him, for I find no fault in him.* *He ought to die according to our law,* they answered, *because he made himself the Son of God.* Pilate had hoped, by bringing Jesus before them in this condition, to have excited their compassion; but finding them inexorable, and that they now brought forward a new charge, he was the more afraid, perhaps from some vague notion that his prisoner might be more than a mortal. He therefore again withdrew into the palace, and asked Jesus whence he was. Not choosing by revealing his dignity to influence a judge who was concerned only with the question of his innocence, our Saviour made no reply. The Governor expressed his astonishment at his silence: *Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and power to release thee?* He then answered, *thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above; therefore he who, not having this authority, delivered me unto thee, hath the greater sin;* meaning, I conceive, the high priest, who was better able to know his innocence, and who had forced this trial upon the Governor. The object of the speech seems to have been to teach Pilate, that it was not by accident, but by God's providence, that he stood at his tribunal; and that though ignorance might extenuate his sin, he would not in condemning him be guiltless. This made Pilate the more anxious to save him; but the Jews exclaimed, *If thou release this Man, thou art not Cæsar's friend.*

Who-loud and confused acclamations from the crowd of *Maris*, (that is, in Syriac, *Lord,*) intimated whom they meant to ridicule by this mock show." Philo in Flaccum.

soever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Cæsar; thus intimating a threat of accusing him to his jealous and suspicious master Tiberius, by whom he had been reprimanded not long before. Pilate now came out on the pavement, and had Jesus once more brought forth, and expostulated with the people; *Shall I crucify your King?* They answer, *We have no king but Cæsar,* thus publicly renouncing their allegiance to their Messiah. Seeing that the people grew tumultuous, and apprehending that his acquittal of Jesus might be represented as treasonable, Pilate at length sacrificed his conscience to his fear. But first he appealed to their religious feelings, by transferring as far as he could the guilt of the compulsory sentence he was about to pronounce from himself to them, by washing his hands before them in token of his innocence. This he might do agreeably to an heathen rite; yet, as it was on the Jews that he wanted to make an impression, it is more probable that he imitated, as far as he could, the law of Moses, which, in the case of an unknown murder, ordered the elders of the nearest city to wash their hands publicly, and say, *our hands have not shed this blood^b.* Not only the priests, but also the people, showed their eagerness to take the responsibility upon themselves and their posterity; *his blood be on us and on our children!* But though they could not exonerate Pilate, they thus made the condemnation of the Messiah a national act; and the weight of this blood lies heavy on their dispersed and despised posterity, even at this distant day!

It is unprecedented in the annals of mankind, that a person, at the very time of his condemnation, should be declared to be innocent by the person who delivered him up, by the judge who passed sentence, and by the officer who superintended his execution; while those who so clamorously demanded his death, could substantiate no

^a Deut. xxi. 7.

charge against him. So wonderfully were all the circumstances arranged, to make it evident that Jesus suffered without guilt. We may also observe, that as the various methods taken by Pilate to save his life were unsuccessful, they served, though unintentionally, to aggravate and protract his sufferings. At first sight it seems scarcely credible, that a whole people should cry out for the putting to death as a malefactor one whose whole life had been a succession of acts of benevolence, *who went about doing good*, and had miraculously healed the diseased, removed bodily defects, and even restored the dead to life. But our astonishment will cease on recollecting, that a miracle, which we justly regard as a decisive proof of a divine mission, was in that age only considered indicative of the agency of a being more powerful than man. They did not, like us, infer the truth of the doctrine from the miracle, but from the nature of the doctrine, whether the agent was an angel or a demon: and according to their prejudices, the doctrine of our Lord was blasphemous.

137. *Judas returns the bribe he had received: and after declaring his Master's innocence, hangs himself in despair.*
Matt. xxvii. 3—10. Acts i. 18—20.

Judas, finding that Jesus was condemned to death, and wrought no miracle for his deliverance, repented, but not like Peter with *a godly sorrow*; for his grief produced not contrition but remorse, which drove him to despair and suicide. He offered, however, the only reparation in his power. He would have returned his bribe to the priests, declaring that he had sinned in delivering up an innocent person; but they unfeelingly answered, *What is that to us? thou art to see to that.* Hereupon he flung the thirty pieces of silver into the temple, it should seem into the sanctuary itself, (*ναὸς*,) and withdrew, and hung himself, probably

before his Master's crucifixion. St. Peter's description of his deathⁱ may be reconciled with that of Matthew, by supposing that after he had suspended himself, the bough of the tree broke; and that, falling from a considerable height, he burst asunder; and certainly the wood of the tree, which from the tradition that he hung himself on it bears his name, is very brittle^k. The rulers consulted how they should dispose of the money which he had rejected. They scrupled to lay it out for religious uses; yet desirous of spending it in some way that might appear charitable, they purchased with it a potter's field, of course of little value, for the burial of strangers; and so inadvertently completed the fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah^l, who hath both foretold the exact price at which Jehovah should be valued by his people, and also that it should be *cast to the potter in the house of the Lord*.

138. *Jesus is led away to be crucified. Matt. xxvii. Mark xv.
Luke xxiii.*

The soldiers, on the condemnation of Jesus by the Governor, stripped him of his royal robe, but left on his head the crown of thorns; so that when he hung naked upon the cross, he still appeared as a King. It was at the third hour^m that he was led to the place of execution. We read of crucifixion in the history of the Egyptians, Greeks, and Carthaginians. The latter, we may suppose, received it from their ancestors, the Canaanites; yet though it might be known in the time of Moses, the

ⁱ Acts i. 18.

^k This Arbor Judæ of the early Botanists, the Circis Siliquestra of Linnæus, a native of Palestine, is not uncommon in our shrubberies.

^l Zechariah xi. 13.

^m St. John writes, *at the sixth*, but his text must have been early corrupted, for the reading *third* of some MSS. is confirmed by Clement of Alexandria, and by St. John's versifier Nonnus.

Divine Author of his code was too merciful to condemn even the worst offenders to so severe a punishment; and therefore it would not have been suffered by our Lord, if the sovereignty of the Holy Land had not passed over to the Romans. Among them it was the mode of executing persons of the lowest condition, and was deemed so disgraceful, that Cicero^a exclaims, that it should be absent not from the bodies only of Roman citizens, but from their thoughts, their eyes, and their ears, the expectation and even the very naming of the cross being unworthy of a free man; and when expatiating upon the crimes of Verres, he singles out as the most atrocious, the crucifixion of a Roman, declaring, that no language is adequate to stigmatise sufficiently the infliction upon such of this most cruel and most shocking punishment, which was reserved for slaves. “To bind a citizen of Rome, is a crime; to beat him, an enormity; to put him to death, almost parricide; what shall I call the lifting him up upon a cross^b? ” To the ancient heathen, then, the Cross of Christ was a greater stumbling-block than we can well conceive; for its use, abolished by Constantine out of respect to our Saviour, has never been revived; and to our imagination it is dignified and sanctified by his having made it the very instrument of his triumph^c. To a Roman, who saw in it nothing more than the legal mode of punishing foreigners and slaves, it was only associated with ideas of guilt and ignominy. “The Pagans,” says Justin Martyr, in his second Apology, “are fully convinced of our insanity, for giving the second place, after the immutable and eternal God and Father of all, to a person who had been crucified.” To the Jews it was even still more odious; for they esteemed him who died on it as not only condemned by men, but forsaken by God. “The

^a Oration for Rabirius.

^b Juvenal, vi. 218. Cicero in Verrem, v.

^c Eph. ii. 16.

person whom you call the Messiah," says the Jew Trypho in his dialogue with that Father, "incurred the lowest infamy, since he fell under the greatest curse of the law, crucifixion; for it is written, *cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree*^q." The very same text had been previously brought forward by an Apostle^r, to magnify the Saviour's love, in suffering for us as an execrable malefactor; and we perceive, from this consent of Gentile and Jew, that when it is said that *Christ endured the Cross*^s, it might be truly added, *despising the shame*. How striking then to the Galatians must have been the Apostle's expression of glo-
rying in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, which must have appeared to them a contradiction in terms. "The Cross in itself was an object full of shame: as borne by Jesus, it was full of glory. It would have been less remarkable, if he had only said he gloried in his Redeemer's exaltation after he left the world, or in the glory which he had enjoyed with his Father before he entered into it; but the object of the Apostle's glorying is the Redeemer, not as powerful and exalted, but as condemned and crucified. We shall cease, however, to wonder when we consider, that in the Cross we have the brightest display of the union of Divine justice and Divine mercy; justice in punishing our sins in him, mercy in forgiving them for his sake^t." Crucifixion was likewise, from the pain it gave, and its long duration, a most cruel punishment; so that the Romans, to express the greatest degree of suffering, borrowed from it the term, *excruciating*^u. The prisoner, having first been scourged, and stripped naked, was fastened to the upright beam, by tying or nailing his feet; and on the transverse by his hands, wounds in which, from the abundance of the nerves, are peculiarly painful; and these wounds by exposure to the air would soon

^q Justin, p. 271, 90. ^r Gal. iii. 13. ^s Heb. xii. 2.

^t Maclaurin's Sermons. "On Glorifying in the Cross."

^u Cooper's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 209.

become inflamed. From the unnatural position in which the body is placed, a more than usual quantity of blood is impelled into the stomach and head, and the obstruction to its return into the system produces an intolerable internal excitement, which is continually increasing^y. Thus suspended, some persons hung for days, until they perished through agony and want of food, for no part of the punishment was in itself mortal; but Jesus expired after six hours, worn out by previous sufferings. Dreadful as must have been the punishment to all, it was greatly aggravated in the case of our Redeemer both as to body and soul; and it is well that this should be impressed upon our minds, because it is related without any attempt to work upon the feelings, and they are naturally blunted by our familiarity with the fact.

The place of execution was called Golgotha, or the place of a skull, from its rounded shape, or the tradition that the skull of Adam had been found there. It was the invariable custom, that every convict should carry his cross^z, I mean, the transverse beam, for the whole would have been too ponderous. Plutarch^a alluded to it, when he says, each sin brings with it its punishment; and our Lord, prophetically referring to his future mode of suffering, had before invited his disciples to imitate him by taking up the cross. This Jesus was now required to do; but he was already so exhausted, that, after bearing it beyond the gate, he sunk under the burden, and they were obliged to remove it to another. Nor will this surprise us, if we consider, that he had already endured more than any other person that has

^y From the Pictorial Bible, which derives this information from a German physician, who wrote a treatise on our Lord's Crucifixion.

^z Artemidorus, Ov. ii. 61. Furcifer, the Latin for a rogue, means literally he who carries the furca, that is, the instrument on which he is to suffer.

^a De serâ Numinis vindictâ.

been led to public execution. He had had no sleep the preceding night: for after the paschal supper, instead of returning as he had been accustomed to Bethany, he was taken as a prisoner to the father-in-law of the high priest. The night and early morning had passed away in his examination before the Sanhedrim, the Governor, Herod, and the Governor again; and he had not only been hurried from place to place, but had been stricken and buffeted by the high priest's servants, by Herod's guards, and by Pilate's officers, and, once at least, cruelly scourged. He had carried his cross beyond the gate, for executions did not take place within the walls, either according to Roman or Jewish law; but he could bear the weight no longer, and they transferred it to Simon the Cyrenian, who was then entering the town. The Evangelists so rarely mention names, that there must be reason for the exception, especially as Mark adds, he was the father of Alexander and Rufus. We find among the Roman saints saluted by Paul in his Epistle, a Rufus *chosen in the Lord*; and his mother, like others commemorated therein, must have *bestowed much labour* upon himself, for he calls her, *his mother and mine*. It is thought that Simon must have been already a believer; and if Mark wrote at Rome, and Rufus was then resident there, it is natural that he should name his father. Simon was a native of Cyrene, a flourishing Greek city, on the African coast between Carthage and Egypt, which has been long deserted. A colony of Jews had been planted there by the first Ptolemy, and they maintained such intercourse with the mother country, that they had in Jerusalem a Synagogue for their special use in conjunction with those of Alexandria^b. Whether Simon was settled in Judæa, or a stranger who had arrived to keep the Passover, does not appear; but we know, that among the foreign Jews who came to attend the following feast of Pentecost, were some

^b Acts vi. 9.

from the parts of Lybia about Cyrene^c. A great multitude of the people followed, especially of women, who beat their breasts, and showed their sympathy by their lamentations. Jesus, regardless of his own sufferings, took this last opportunity of directing their thoughts to the guilt and impending ruin of their nation: telling them to weep not for him, but for themselves and for their children. And in figurative terms describes their misery: *The days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren; and, they shall say to the mountains, fall upon us, and to the hills, cover us. If they do these things to the green tree, what shall be done to the dry?* that is, if the Romans inflict this punishment upon the innocent, how awful will be the chastisement of the guilty! Two malefactors (who were *robbers*^d) were led out to suffer with him; and thus was literally fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy^e, *he was numbered among the transgressors.* They were probably associates of Barabbas, whom the infatuated people preferred to the *Lord of life and glory*. It was permitted to give to the condemned persons on their way to execution a draught of wine mingled with myrrh, of a stupefying quality; and some charitable person seems to have prepared for him this cordial, but, having tasted, he declined drinking it, doubtless because he would recur to no mode of mitigating death, which it was his fixed purpose to endure in all its bitterness^f. The refreshment of vinegar

^c Acts ii. 10.

^d λῃσταὶ, not κλεπταὶ, thieves.

^e Isaiah liii. 12.

^f When, in the reign of Gallienus, A.D. 262, Fructuosus, Bishop of Taragona, and his two deacons, were led to be burnt in the amphitheatre, their friends offered them spiced wine, which they, in imitation of their Saviour, refused.

Sic Christus sitiens Crucis sub hora

Oblatum sibi poculam recusans,

Nec libare volens sitim peregit. *Prudentius*, Hymn vi.

Ruimart Acta Martyrum, p. 220. The wine mixed with myrrh of

offered afterwards by the Roman soldiers, there was not the same reason to refuse.

*139. The Crucifixion. Matt. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii.
John xix.*

Four Roman soldiers nailed Jesus to the cross, and while they were so employed, *he interceded for the transgressors*^f, urging the only plea in extenuation of their guilt—their ignorance. The whole frame of a person crucified must have received a convulsive shock, from the elevation of the cross, and its precipitation into the ground. But it seems more probable, that it had been previously erected, and that Jesus was placed on it when raised; and also, that it was lower than painters, who have never seen one, represent it, to heighten the effect. Above his head, as was customary, was written the cause for which he suffered, in the three languages there in use; and Pilate had worded it to express what he really was, to the mortification of the priests; and would not alter it at their request, to suit their opinion. The soldiers divided among themselves his cloak; but cast lots for his inner vest, because, being woven without seam, rending would have spoiled it. Thus they fulfilled, unconsciously, two minute predictions in the twenty-second Psalm, which is throughout a prophetic history of the Saviour's final sufferings and ultimate triumph, and to which he drew the attention of the bystanders, and of future ages, by repeating the first verse. In this painful

Mark, and the vinegar mixed with gall of Matthew, appear to be two names for the same cup; for χολὴ means not gall only, but also any bitter herb. (Jeremiah xxiii. 15. viii. 14.) This deadly wine (*οἶνον κατανύξεως*, Psalm lx. 3.) is the same as that which is called, with apparent contradiction, *οἶνον ἄκρατον κεκερασμένος*, that is, wine *unmixed* with water, but *mixed* with stupefying drugs. The Proverb, *Give strong drink unto him who is ready to perish*, (xxxi. 6.) refers to this custom.

^f Isaiah liii. 12.

state Jesus continued from the sixth to the ninth hour, that is, from nine in the morning to three in the afternoon, exposed to the mockery of both people and rulers, who insulted him, as I have already observed, in the prophetic language of that wonderful Psalm. One, too, even of his fellow-sufferers joined in reviling him; but the other acknowledged that he *had done nothing amiss*, and received in return the assurance, that he should accompany him that very day to Paradise, the place of departed spirits^b. His petition was only, *Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom*; but Jesus granted him more than he had asked, an immediate reward; and thus, in the moment of his lowest degradation, performed an act of divine Sovereignty, by the forgiveness of sin. This case is a solitary instance which can never occur again: recorded to preserve the dying penitent from despair, by showing that even those who at the last extremity throw themselves upon the Redeemer's mercy, will be admitted into his kingdom. At the same time it holds out no encouragement to any who sin against conviction, and presumptuously flatter themselves that they shall have time and inclination to repent upon a death-bed. Probably, as has been well observed, no one ever so improved a dying hour as this robber, or under such unfavourable circumstances; for he believed Jesus to be the Messiah, when one disciple had betrayed, another had denied, and all had forsaken him; when the nation had rejected him, and his crucifixion seemed to prove that he was disowned not only by them, but by God. This robber acknowledged the justice of his own sentence,

^b This distinction, familiar to the Jews, is observed by St. Paul, who tells the Corinthians (2 Cor. xii. 2, 4.) that he was caught up both to the third Heaven and to Paradise; that in the former, he might contemplate the scene of supreme felicity which awaits the just after the general resurrection: and that in the latter, he might be acquainted with their present enjoyment of the intermediate state.

and bore testimony to the innocence of Jesus; he was moreover only anxious for salvation; for he could have nothing to hope or fear in a world which he was about to leave; and consequently he must have believed in the spiritual nature of the Messiah's kingdom. His faith then was of that saving kind, which would have expanded into all the actions of a Christian life, if time had been granted. One instance of the acceptance of a dying repentance is recorded, that none might despair; and only one, that none might presume. We need not, to enhance our wonder, assume, that this was his first knowledge of Jesus: he might have heard him discourse, and seen his miracles, and the darkness which convinced the centurion might have affected him.

In the height of his sufferings, Jesus still showed his affection for his mother, who, accompanied by her sister Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary of Magdala, and the beloved disciple, had the resolution to stand near. To the care of the last he bequeathed her, and she henceforth shared his home. About three o'clock, Jesus cried out in the Psalmist's words, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!* Commentators generally suppose he spoke under the influence of the feelings which had oppressed him during his agony, and that the words show that the withdrawing of his Father's consolatory presence distressed him more than all the sufferings that the malice of his enemies could inflict. Others, that by commencing the Psalm, he meant not to express his feelings, but to declare the fulfilment of it; but I see no reason why we may not unite these opinions. A centurion with some soldiers was in attendance. A vessel of diluted vinegarⁱ, their ordinary beverage, stood

ⁱ Some commentators take ὅξος for a weak acid wine; but it was vinegar mixed with water, called *posca*; and it appears from a law of Constantine, that soldiers were on alternate days provided with this liquor.

near them, and Jesus complaining of thirst, the natural consequence of acute suffering, one of them raised up a sponge dipped in it on a stalk of hyssop^k. The rest, less merciful, said, *Let us see if Elias will come to take him down*, not understanding his language, and supposing that when he said *Eli*, he had called not upon God, but on the prophet Elijah, as he cited the Psalm in Hebrew, *Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani*. *When I was thirsty, they gave me vinegar to drink*, exclaims David, as the Saviour's type, in the sixtieth Psalm; and our Lord having received it, cried out with all the energy that he could exert, *It is finished*; and then having again in a loud voice exclaimed, *Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit*, he bowed his head, and expired.

His loud voice is recorded by the first three Evangelists, to mark, in the opinion of Doddridge, that the surrender of his Spirit was a voluntary act; and this he endeavours to support from the language of Matthew, *yielded up the ghost*, ἀφῆκε τὸ Πνεῦμα, and of John, *gave up the ghost*, παρέδωκε τὸ Πνεῦμα: but the former phrase is also that of Euripides^l, even in describing the sacrifice of Polyxena, and seems, like *he fell on sleep*, used of Stephen when stoned, to mean no more than a peaceful departure out of life. Doddridge's opinion is supported by Hales and other eminent divines, but it appears open to the objection, that it makes our Lord's death not the act of the Jews and Gentiles, but his own. The intention of his loud cry was, I conceive, that all might hear his dying declaration of confidence in his Father, and that for this purpose, his mind triumphing over the body, rallied for a final effort.

Thus died the righteous King of the Jews the death of a criminal slave, and by death *finished* the work he had come

^k The hyssop is said to grow higher in Palestine than in the south of Europe, and the Cross was also probably lower than it is generally represented.

^l Hecuba 571.

into the world to accomplish, the deliverance not only of his own, but of all nations from the bondage of Satan, and their restoration to the favour of their Creator, and the capability of holiness and happiness. Having slain *the enmity* by the Cross, *Mercy and Truth*, to use the Psalmist's words^m, *met together, Righteousness and Peace kissed each other*. The Mission of the Son of God was finished: henceforward he had nothing to detain him on earth, but to satisfy his disciples of his Resurrection, and to instruct them in *the things pertaining to the kingdom of God*. Forty days were employed in qualifying them for their office of Evangelists, and then he returned to the glory which he had enjoyed from the beginning with his Father, but of which he had divested himself for a short season, "for us men and for our salvation."

140, 141. *The prodigies that ensued. The body of Jesus is granted by the Governor to Joseph of Arimathaea, who deposits it in his own new tomb. Matt. xxvii. 45—61. Mark xv. 38—47. Luke xxiv. 44—56. John xix. 31—42.*

The death of Jesus was accompanied with miracles sufficient to convince all, who did not wilfully shut their eyes, of his being the Messiah; and we read that the centurion who was in attendance was so affected by some of those signs, as well as by his dying behaviour, that he exclaimed, *This was truly the Son of God!* As there is no article in this speech, as recorded by the first two Evangelists, some would render it a son of a God, as if the centurion, an idolater, took Jesus for one of his own deities. But it is equally wanting in both nouns when his revilers said, *if thou be the Son of God, come down from the Cross*; and Middleton, in his doctrine of the Greek Article, gives a reason for the omission. Since then he was condemned for claiming this appellation in a higher and peculiar sense, it is more reason-

^m Ps. lxxxv. 10.

able to understand it as a confession of his being the Messiah, of whom even a Gentile living in Judæa must have heard; and the corresponding passage in Luke, *Certainly this Man was righteous*, that is, he was innocent, and really was what he professed to be, with the remark, that the centurion *glorified*, or praised, *God*, confirms this interpretation, and may even imply his conversion. These miracles were, 1. a preternatural darkness; 2. the rending of the veil which divided the “Holy of Holies” from the outer sanctuary; and 3. an earthquake, followed by the resurrection of the bodies of some of the saints. 1. This darkness, which continued three hours, half the time that Jesus hung upon the Cross, seems to have had an immediate effect, for the scoffs and insults levelled at our Saviour were all during the first three hours of the crucifixion; and a manifest change of feeling towards him, arising, as it should seem, from a misgiving as to his character, is discoverable in the bystanders after the expiration of that time. Is not this change of conduct very naturally explained by the awe with which they contemplated the fearful darkness that came onⁿ? Commentators are not agreed whether the term, the whole earth, is to be taken in the most extensive sense, or to be restricted to Judæa. The early Christian writers appealed to the Roman Archives in confirmation of the fact, which they considered universal; but the word rendered earth, as we have seen before, does not necessarily mean more than the whole land of Judæa, and the restriction of it to the country in which our Lord suffered seems to be most appropriate. This darkness probably resembled that brought upon Egypt by Moses, and must have been miraculous; for the length of its duration, and the period when it occurred, the full moon, prevent our ascribing it to an eclipse. 2. The Rending of the Veil, threw open to view the *tabernacle*, which is called the *Holiest of all*, which the successor of

ⁿ Blunt on the Veracity of the Gospels.

Aaron was alone permitted to enter; but now when our great High Priest, whom he but represented, was about to enter *into heaven itself*, of which that *worldly sanctuary* was the type, it significantly intimated, that the figurative dispensation of Moses was to be done away. Henceforth the privilege which one individual had alone enjoyed, and that only once in the year, was to be granted to all believers, who on all days might draw near, *in full assurance of faith*, to the mercy-seat of God, with the confidence that they should be heard through the prevailing merits of the Priest of a better covenant, who, having propitiated his Father, by the sacrifice of himself, has sat down for ever at his right hand, to make intercession for them. As Christ the true victim expired at the time of evening sacrifice, some of the priests must have been present; yet we do not hear that any were converted by the prodigy. As a curtain supplying the place of a door would naturally be torn from the bottom *upwards*; the rending of it *downwards* is noticed by the Evangelist. 3. The third sign was an earthquake, which shivered the rocks and threw open graves; out of which, (but not till after he who was the *first-fruits of them that slept arose*^o, the bodies of many of the saints were raised, and they went into the holy city, and appeared unto many, as an earnest of the resurrection of all. Commentators are not agreed whether they were the saints of past time, or those that had recently died. But I conclude the latter, from Peter's^p observation on the day of Pentecost, that David was still buried; for we cannot suppose that if the former had risen^p, he would have been left in the grave; moreover, the resurrection of personal acquaintance would more effectually confirm the faith of believers. The multitude, we find, rightly interpreted these prodigies as testimonies of God's approbation of the Sufferer, and returned with the strongest demonstrations of sorrow; for their rage

^o 1 Cor. xv. 20.

^p Acts xi. 29.

which had been artfully excited, had given place to regret and self-reproach; and their conviction of his innocence thus attested, prepared the way for the conversion of the three thousand, on the ensuing feast of Pentecost.

The Mosaic Law^q, requiring that the bodies of convicts should be buried on the day of their execution, *that the land be not defiled*, was still in force^r; and it was the Roman custom, in ordinary cases, to grant to them the rites of sepulture. Ulpian, on the Duties of a Proconsul, states, that the bodies of executed persons ought to be given up to their relatives, according to the practice of Augustus; and Tiberius's withholding them is represented both by Tacitus^s and Suetonius^t as an act of uncommon cruelty. The approaching Festival, when the first sheaf of the harvest was to be reaped, and from which the feast of weeks, called by the Hellenists Pentecost, was reckoned, was always *a high day*, and that year a double Sabbath. The rulers, therefore, waited upon Pilate to request that the legs of the convicts might be broken to hasten death, that they might be removed before the evening. Thus our Lord's enemies made themselves instrumental to the fulfilment of his promise to the penitent thief, that he should *that day* be with him in Paradise; and their not breaking his limbs, was an additional evidence that he had previously expired. Even if he had been then alive, the wound of the lance, with which one of the soldiers pierced his side, which is supposed to have penetrated the heart, must have caused death. He who saw the wound given has borne witness to the fact; not the soldier, called in the legend from his spear ($\lambda\circ\gamma\chi\eta$) Longinus, but the Evangelist himself; for otherwise it would have been not he who saw, but he who pierced; and he adds, *he knoweth that he saith true*; a phraseology usual with St. John yet here: I agree with

^q Deut. xxi. 22.

^r Josephus, Wars, iv. 5.

^s Ann. vi. 29.

^t Suetonius 61.

Wakefield, that (from his use, instead of *αὐτὸς, he,* of *ἐκεῖνος, that person,*) he speaks not of himself, but appeals to his Master, as the Searcher of hearts, to vouch it also. The verb *bare record*, or rather hath borne record, *μεμαρτύρηκε*, is in the past sense; and may we not suppose that this beloved disciple, who saw the wound inflicted, *bare record* afterwards, not only in conversation, but also in his Epistle, which is generally believed to have been written long before his Gospel? From the mode of his reference to it, he appears to have had a deeper meaning, and to have recorded the fact not only as an evidence of his Lord's death, but as emblematical of the twofold salvation which he thereby wrought for believers, deliverance, that is, from the guilt and from the dominion of sin; of Justification and of Sanctification, of which the two Sacraments, under the "outward and visible signs" of water and of wine, (as representing the blood,) are memorials and pledges.

Crucifixion is a lingering punishment, not in its nature mortal, but proving fatal by gradual exhaustion. To live on the cross three days was a common occurrence; and Timotheus, and Maura his wife, who were among the martyrs of Upper Egypt, under the persecution of the Emperor Gallus, A.D. 253^u, are said not to have expired till the ninth. Many perished, not from the punishment itself, but from hunger; some were devoured by birds of prey; and there are instances of persons, who, being taken down alive, recovered; as one of three friends of Josephus, who were granted to his solicitations by Titus*. Pilate, therefore, and the centurion on duty of whom he enquired, were surprised, that Jesus, after hanging only six hours on the cross, should be dead; and the surprise of the centurion was the greater, because he knew that he had

^u Baronius.

* See Josephus's Life of himself.

expired with a loud exclamation, which proved his strength to be entire.

A desire to ascertain or ensure his death, led the soldier to pierce his side; and the solemnity of the Evangelist's words, occurring as they do in the middle of a narrative, and almost interrupting the connection of a sentence, show that he considered the fact of the water and the blood gushing forth as most important. "Commentators," says Dr. Burton^y, "have generally agreed, that the fact here so earnestly stated as a matter of belief, was the death of Jesus; and modern commentators will add, that the presence of water mixed with blood, proves that the pericardium was pierced; and it has been asserted, that in the case of persons dying from torture, the quantity of water is increased. I have no hesitation in asserting, that to prove the death of Christ from this fact, is an idea entirely modern; and when we consider the very general success which the Gnostic doctrines had met with in Asia, it seems more natural to suppose, that St. John recorded this fact, with a view to confute the Docetæ. Of all the circumstances which attended the crucifixion, none would be more conclusive for the corporeal nature of Jesus; and it was natural that the Evangelist should dwell with particular emphasis upon a fact which he had seen with his own eyes, and which so powerfully confuted the arguments of his opponents." The Professor has shown, that, in recording the fact, the Evangelist intended to confute the Gnostics; but there appears to be no necessity for concluding that this was his only design. On the contrary, I believe that it is also recorded as evidence of death. As such it is most important, for it anticipates the objection of infidels, that Jesus did not die in consequence of crucifixion. A difficulty has been felt by medical writers, and some have even maintained that he was still alive when pierced, though

^y Bampton Lectures for 1829.

clearly in opposition to the context; others, that the gushing forth of blood and water was preternatural. I insert some observations from the anonymous publication of a Physician, which appear to me very interesting, as throwing light both upon this obscure passage, and upon our Lord's sufferings. "It has been supposed from his previous declaration, that no man took his life from him, but that he laid it down of himself; but the repeated declaration, that he was put to death by his enemies, shows that the former language meant no more than that he might have declined to die^v." The record concerning the blood and the water, this writer considers as explaining, (at least to a more scientific age,) that the real cause of the death of Jesus was rupture of the heart, occasioned by mental agony. Such rupture is attended by instant death, without previous exhaustion, and by the effusion into the pericardium of blood, which in this particular case, though scarcely in any other, separates into its two constituent parts, so as to present the appearance commonly termed blood and water^z. A degree of mental distress, far inferior to that endured by him who was emphatically styled, *the Man of sorrows*, has a tendency to produce bloody sweat, oppression of the chest, incapacity of exertion, and, finally, rupture of the heart; especially if accompanied with prolonged physical exertions, particularly in a constrained position. These symptoms are expressed, or implied, throughout the narrative of the sufferings of Jesus. Thus, on entering the garden, he exclaimed, *my soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death*; and it seems to be intimated in the Epistle to the Hebrews^a,

^v Evangelical Register, 1829. Article by Jason.

^z Bonnet gives two examples, vol. i. p. 585, 887. I have constantly found water in the pericardium of persons capitally punished, says the author of the article *Pericarde*, in the Yverdun Encyclopedie.

^a Heb. v. 4—9.

that death would have been the speedy result of his agony, if he had not been strengthened by supernatural aid: and notwithstanding the support of an angel, his sweat was as clots of blood falling to the ground. This implies excessive palpitation; and on his way to Golgotha, though, as appears from the sequel, his inward strength was unimpaired, he required another to bear his Cross. Sudden death is also occasioned by passions of the mind, without the intervention of rupture of the heart; but, in that case, the blood, instead of coagulating, remains liquid; and in mere dilatation of the heart from grief, the mode of death is not so rapid, nor if the side were pierced, would the effusion be so immediate, or so abundant. The prophecy, *Reproach hath broken my heart, I am full of heaviness; I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint, my heart like wax is melted in the midst of my body,* would on this supposition be literally fulfilled^b. This fact gives a peculiar propriety to the passage, in which the Saviour is described as *pouring out his life's blood unto death*^c. The sacrifices that typify his death imply that it was an atonement for sin, a doctrine continually asserted in the Epistles, and apparent from the peculiarity of his behaviour. He who sustained with firmness every other trial, was destined to endure an infliction of overwhelming severity, in which the very perfection of his character was to prove the principal cause of distress. To advance the Divine glory by magnifying the law, and to accomplish the salvation of mankind, Christ consented to lose the light of God's countenance, including the sense of his favour, and the comfort of his communion, although aware that the misery thus incurred would occasion his death. We may deduce from his agony in the garden, and the revival of his mental sufferings on the Cross, that his death was not merely that of a martyr in a righteous cause, which

^b Psalms xxii. lxix.

^c Isaiah liii. 12.

would have been, if not triumphant, yet without dismay, but that of an atoning victim. It was the only death worthy of him to undergo, who was the spotless *Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world*, and of him to accept, who had announced *the sacrifices of God to be a broken spirit*. It was the death of a pure and perfect Man, sustaining and discharging the penalty due to human depravity, thereby acquiring an equitable claim to *see of the travail of his soul, and to be satisfied*, and demonstrating, as was designed, that God is at the same time *both just, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus*." At this time was verified in this true paschal Lamb,—by the forbearance of heathen soldiers, who passed him unmolested because already dead, while they brake the legs of the other two who *were in the same condemnation*,—the command, *a bone of it shall not be broken*. It is quoted, we may believe, to teach believers even to the end of time, that the minutest injunctions of the ceremonial Law had been devised in order to direct the spiritual worshipper to Christ, the true Deliverer from the guilt of sin. From this and other quotations in the New Testament we learn, not only that the Law broadly shadowed forth in its ordinances the Gospel, but that the types and antitypes were made to correspond, even in points in which, unless it had been pointed out to us by an authority which cannot be disputed, we should hardly have thought of the coincidence. Such a correspondence could only be effected by the providence of the Supreme Disposer of events, who knoweth all things from the beginning, and can alone so plan the ceremonies of one age, as to harmonize with the events of another. It will also fulfil the prediction, that when in the latter days the *Spirit of grace and of supplication* is poured upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem^d, *they shall look upon me whom they pierced; and they shall mourn as one mourneth for an only son*. But awful

^d Zech. xii. 10.

and terrific will then be his appearance to the unconverted ; and with a reference to those, it seems to have been cited by the beloved disciple in his description of the revelation granted to him in the isle of Patmos, when he writes, *Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they who pierced him.*

Isaiah had foretold, what appeared to be incompatible, the ignominious death and the honourable interment of the Messiah. Both predictions, however, were perfectly accomplished in our Lord ; for the wisdom of God provided that his body should be handled only by holy men, and that the most costly provision for embalment should be the prelude of the glorious Resurrection, which should follow this disgraceful death. Two men of rank and fortune, Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus, who from fear had hitherto concealed their belief, now disregarding the shame of the Cross, even before their Master's resurrection had ennobled it, testified openly their estimation of him who had been condemned by the nation and executed by the Romans, the first by begging his body from the governor, the second by preparing for its embalment; while the Apostles, with the exception of John, were afraid of showing themselves. The request was granted; and as Joseph had excavated for himself a sepulchre in a garden close to Calvary, that fact, as well as the approach of the Sabbath, decided where they should place it. Had the tomb been distant, they might have taken it in the first instance to a friend's house ; and as the Sabbath was coming on, it must have remained wherever it had been deposited, till the day of rest was over. It was certainly a providential concurrence of circumstances that induced them to take it directly from the Cross to the place which best suited the event that was reserved for the third day. It was left, in consequence, under the custody of enemies, who by their very precautions to prevent imposition,

supplied themselves decisive evidence of the fact of our Lord's Resurrection. Whatever was requisite to fulfil the prediction, *with the rich man was his tomb^f*, was done, and no more; for though the body was deposited on a bed of spices, it was not embalmed. His friends indeed piously intended to pay this last tribute of respect, but their intention was delayed by the intervention of the Sabbath, and when that was over, death had ceased to have dominion over *this Prince of life*. It was to fulfil this melancholy duty, that the women visited the sepulchre so early in the morning of the resurrection-day; and their hastening thither proved a blessing to themselves, and to the Apostles; for though they treated their reports as idle tales, yet the intelligence must have had an effect upon their minds; and when the proof was brought home to them by the Lord's appearance to themselves on the same day, they were prepared to see him with less surprise and perturbation. Nicodemus, who was wealthy, testified his regard by the prodigious quantity of spices which he brought, enough, it has been suggested by enemies, to embalm in the ordinary way two hundred bodies. The quantity was no less than a hundred pounds weight of a mixture of myrrh and aloes^g; on which, as on a bed, he and Joseph laid the corpse^h, and swathed it in linen bandages; and then, as the Sabbath was drawing on, they rolled a great stone against the

^f Isaiah liii.

^g The aloes mentioned here and in Psalm xlvi. 8. was not the purgative drug now known by that name, but *Excæcaria agallocha*, an aromatic gum, very fragrant and of high price, which was imported from the farther East.

^h We learn, both from the history of King Asa in the Old Testament, (2 Chron. xvi. 14.) and of Herod the Great in Josephus, (Ant. xxxiii.) that at grand funerals the Jews were accustomed to lay deceased persons upon a bed filled with spieces, part of which was afterwards burnt at their burial.

sepulchre, and withdrew; meaning, when it was over, to complete the honour they intended to pay to his remains. *As the manner of the Jews is to bury*, adds the English version of St. John's Gospel; but such an expensive manner could never have generally prevailed in any country. Here the unlearned reader is misled, for the word in the original is not θάπτειν, to bury, but ἐνταφιάζειν, to prepare for the tomb, and it is used in the Septuagint of the embalment of Jacob and Joseph. Such was the manner in which all Egyptians who could afford it honoured their deceased relatives; and mummies, as we call their dead bodies so prepared, many of a wonderful antiquity, are not uncommon in the Museums of Europe. The process is detailed by Herodotusⁱ; and when St. John writes, *as is the manner of the Jews*, it seems as if he intended to contrast their manner, which did not open the body, with the Egyptian, which removed the viscera, and filled up the space with spices. The filial piety of Joseph, who was only second in rank to Pharaoh, provided the most sumptuous funeral for his father; and he appears to have been embalmed himself; for the Apostle to the Hebrews^k gives his commandment respecting his own bones as an instance of his faith, since he thereby declared his dying conviction, *that God would surely visit* in due time the Israelites, and bring them out of Egypt into their own promised land.

Mary Magdalene and Mary the wife of Cleopas, the virgin's sister, had sat over against the sepulchre, till the sabbath admonished them to retire. As Zebedee's wife, Salomé, though generally mentioned with them, is not named on this occasion, it is a reasonable conjecture that she was in attendance upon our Lord's mother; and had, with the beloved disciple, prevailed upon her to leave the afflicting spectacle of his sufferings, *while the sword was piercing through her own soul*, soon after she had been

ⁱ ii. 90.

^k Heb. xi. 22.

consigned to his care as a son. These women were then too much absorbed in sorrow to make any preparation for the embalming, consequently they could not (as the Sabbath soon commenced) procure spices till after sunset on Saturday evening; whereas Joanna and the other female disciples might have been ready before; and none of them seem to have known what had been done already by Nicodemus and Joseph. The observation, that the tomb was *new*, and *hewn out of a rock*, is no trivial one, for it shows that there could be no entrance through which a body might be secretly conveyed away; and as no other person had been deposited in it, there could be no doubt of the identity of the person who rose to life out of it. The enemies of Jesus who had procured his death, also unconsciously, by their precautions, defeated their own scheme; for the following morning, when their passover was over, recollecting, what the disciples had forgotten, his declaration, *after three days I will rise again*, they requested, and obtained from the governor, a guard, and secured the sepulchre with a seal, so that there could be no fraud on the part of the soldiers; whereby they have supplied to future ages the most unexceptionable evidence of the reality of our Lord's Resurrection.

PART VII.

142—145. *The visit of the first party of women to the sepulchre.*
Matt. xxviii. 1—15. Mark xvi. 1—11. John xx. 1—18.

THE Resurrection of our Saviour is the pledge and earnest of our own. It is at once the *substance* and the *evidence* of Christianity: the *substance*, because as in Adam we all died, eternal life is through Christ the gift of God to all who believe and obey him; the *evidence*, because it sets God's seal to the reality of his divine mission, and to the truth of his doctrines. None who believe the resurrection of Jesus to be a fact, can doubt his veracity or power; but belief to be reasonable must be built upon evidence, and the more extraordinary an event is, and the more important in its consequences, the stronger is the evidence that we require, before we give it our assent. St. Paul^a allows, that if *Christ be not risen, our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins*; we might therefore expect that all the Evangelists would bear testimony to such a fact; and accordingly we find, that it is not only recorded by each, but is confirmed by the narration of several appearances of their Master after his Resurrection. It had been obscurely predicted by Hosea^b, *In the third day he will raise us up*; and by Isaiah^c, *Thy dead shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise*; and the Psalmist^d had plainly spoken in the person of the Messiah, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption*; but Jesus himself had, whenever he deemed it expedient, repeatedly, without a figure, announced that he should rise again on the third day after he had been put to death. Before that day had closed, he ate and conversed with ten of his Apostles together. He had previously appeared to Mary Magdalene,

^a 1 Cor. xv. 14.

^b Hosea vi. 2.

^c Isaiah xxvi. 19.

^d Psalm xvi. 10.

to some other female believers, to two disciples who were walking in the country, and to Peter. To the fact, there was no human witness. We therefore do not know the precise time that his body lay in the grave, while his soul was proclaiming his propitiatory death to the disembodied spirits in Hades. It must have been left in the sepulchre by Joseph and Nicodemus shortly before sunset on the Friday evening; our Lord must have reanimated it before sunrise on the Sunday morning. According to the Hebrew idiom, he was three days in the grave, that is, an entire one and a part of two. It is generally assumed to have been forty hours, and this belief gave rise to a fast of that duration, which was afterwards extended to forty days. No one can tell the hour when Jesus broke the bands of death; but it must have been *very early*, for the women who set out for the tomb while it *was yet dark*, and *as it began to dawn*, found it open, and were informed that Jesus was risen. There had been an earthquake, and an Angel had come down, and sat upon the stone which had closed it, and which he rolled back, that the risen Lord might leave his temporary tomb. Mary Magdalene was the first person honoured with the sight of him, and soon after he showed himself to the other women; so that they proclaimed the joyful tidings to the Apostles themselves; and they might be distinguished by this preference, because they stood by at the crucifixion, and were then designing to pay him the only mark of respect and affection in their power; whereas the men, with the single exception of St. John, had forsaken him in his hour of misery. The women were many, and their reports are preserved, not with contradictions, but with variations, each Evangelist recording what best suited his object in writing, or seemed desirable to supply the omission of the preceding ones. Their minute discrepancies have been exaggerated by infidels, nor is it of so much importance, as they would wish

us to believe, to reconcile them; for it is not upon the testimony of these women that we receive the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, but on that of the Apostles, and of the Holy Spirit of Truth, which he *hath sent from the Father*, who on the day of Pentecost, and on many other occasions, *testified of and glorified him*. The chief use of this narrative is the refutation of the fabricated story of the guard; for the Apostles were convinced by the Lord's appearance to themselves, and the women are not reckoned in the Acts, or in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, among the witnesses of the Resurrection. Yet their reports, by which the first rays of hope glanced upon the minds of the Apostles, however imperfect and confused they might be, seemed to them worthy of lasting remembrance, and have been consequently committed to writing.

Their discrepancies, instead of diminishing, increase the credibility of the Evangelists, for they prove their scrupulous accuracy; and Grotius, who has discussed them, shows, that though in some circumstances they seem not to correspond, there is no absolute diversity. The events were nearly coincident, or rapidly succeeded each other; and they are told briefly, each Evangelist adding some particular; and therefore it is not surprising that harmonists have pursued different methods of reducing them into one narrative. Many have succeeded so far, as to show, that there are no characters of disagreement in the facts recorded; but it is generally allowed, that the most satisfactory scheme is that of West, which assumes, that the women went in two parties to the sepulchre, and consequently that there was an appearance of Angels to both. Doddridge candidly acknowledges that he prefers it to his own, and the Diates-saron deserts for it the Archbishop's Harmony. It is thus stated with some variation by Townson. "Mary Magdalene is mentioned by Matthew, Mark, and John, as going early to the sepulchre on the first day of the week. Matthew

adds the other Mary; Mark joins with her, Mary the mother of James and Salomé, and his context will not allow us to suppose that there was any other person of the party. Luke, who speaks of a greater number of women, *those who came with him from Galilee*, has so guarded his account, as not to include the three just mentioned; and what is said by him of the Angels that appeared to them, and their behaviour at the tomb, is totally unlike any thing that is related of the two Maries and Salomé. If these things can be made to appear evident, from a comparison of the Evangelists, we must in justice to them consider the women as going successively in a less and a larger company; and this arrangement corresponds exactly with the history of that memorable morning, embraces all the circumstances, and unites the whole into one intelligible and consistent history.” For the superiority of this hypothesis, and for an answer to objections, I must refer to Townson and West, and to the Chronological Arrangement of the Bible by Townsend, who, with his usual diligence and ability, has condensed into a small compass whatever was required to enable the reader to form his own judgment. Macknight, however, not satisfied with this scheme, suggests another: still he agrees with it in making Peter run twice to the tomb without seeing more than the linen clothes, first in company with John^e, and secondly alone^f.

I will state the two schemes; but to form a just comparison, the reader must have a Harmony before him, or bear in mind all the particulars of the four narratives. It is also desirable, that he should have a correct notion of the sepulchre, which did not resemble one of our altar tombs, into which a body is let down, but was an upright excavation, which was closed with a door. Many such may be still seen in Asia Minor, near the ruins of Greek cities; and the Gospels afford an example of their being used for

^e John xx.

^f Luke xxiv.

the purpose of a dwelling, in the narrative of the Gadarene demoniacs. As a stone was rolled against this tomb of Joseph, we may conclude that it was yet unfinished. It is described as consisting of an anti-chamber nine feet square, from which a passage, not exceeding three in height and breadth, leads into the inner room, which is eight by seven; but all must have been somewhat larger, before they were cased and floored with white marble by the Empress Helena. I assume the reputed sepulchre to be the real one; and those who of late have disputed this ancient tradition, are unable to propose any other. Even they will allow, that such was the temporary sepulchre of our Lord, wherever they may place it, as it is formed according to the custom of the times.

According to Macknight, 1. The two Maries visited the sepulchre on *Saturday*, as soon as the Sabbath was over; but returned in consequence of an earthquake and storm. 2. Very early on Sunday, *all the women went out together*, and arrived before sun-rise; and Mary Magdalene ran into the city to tell the Apostles that the body had been taken away. 3. A while after her departure, the women see a vision of angels, and return. 4. As they enter the city, Mary Magdalene, with Peter and John, were coming out of the Apostles' lodging to go to the sepulchre; but *taking a different street*, miss them. 5. Peter and John, having searched the sepulchre, departed, but Mary Magdalene remained. 6. As Peter and John are entering the city, the women left the lodging (having a message to Peter) along with some of the brethren, who were dispatched to examine the truth of their information. They wished to see Peter, but *miss* him and his companions, who are coming in by another street. 7. The brethren, outrunning the women, left them behind; and they follow as quickly as they can, till Jesus met them. The brethren arrived just as Mary Magdalene was leaving the sepulchre, after having

seen the Lord; but did not meet with her, because they took a different course. 8. She running towards the city came up to the women just as Jesus left them. They then all proceed together to the city. 9. While they were returning, the brethren, who had gone forward to the sepulchre, saw the Angels there. They instantly departed in haste; arrived at the lodging, and tell what they had seen, in the hearing of the two disciples, who set out for Emmaus, before the arrival of Mary Magdalene and the other women. 10. After their departure, all the women return. 11. On hearing their report, Peter ran to the sepulchre a second time; and now he too sees his Lord. 12. In the evening, the disciples return from Emmaus, and while telling their story, Jesus himself appeared. If the time should be thought to be too short for so many visits to the tomb, we may reply, that it was longer than many suppose. If that year the passover fell late in April, the sun would have risen to the inhabitants of Jerusalem about twenty-three minutes after five; and the day would have dawned about three. At Emmaus the disciples observed, that it was towards evening, that is, three o'clock; for had it been later they could not have returned time enough to have been present when Jesus showed himself, as the day ended at *sun-set*; and as it was not eight miles from Jérusalem, they must have set out late.

According to Townson, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary set out as soon as it began to dawn on Sunday, calling upon Salomé in their way; and before they reached the tomb, the Saviour had arisen; and an Angel sat upon the stone that had closed it, having rolled it inward. The guard fled in dismay; and soon after, about sun-rise, the women drew near. They had expressed a doubt as to their ability to remove the stone, for it was very great; but perceiving it was gone, they were alarmed; and Mary Magdalene, surmising that the body had been removed,

without staying to ascertain the fact, ran back to inform Peter and John, leaving her two friends to watch till her return. After a pause, they ventured into the outer chamber, and saw the Angel, who encouraged them, saying, *Fear not ye*; intimating, that it was for the enemies and persecutors, not for the friends, of Jesus to be alarmed; and announcing for their consolation the un hoped-for though predicted fact, *he is not here, for he is risen, as he said. Tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.* On the night of his apprehension, Jesus had comforted the Eleven with these last words, *After I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee.* The sending to them therefore of these words on the morning of the Resurrection, was a token from Christ himself that it was his message. If they did not attend to it as such, the fault was not that of the gracious sender. The mention of Peter's name in particular (for after his three denials, he might doubt if his Master intended to include him under the title of Disciple) was an instance of special kindness; at the same time it was calculated to remind him of the prediction of those denials, and to put him upon reflecting, whether the same Lord who had foretold his fall, might not with equal truth have spoken of his own Resurrection. The Angel invited them to enter the inner room, that his report might be confirmed by the sight of the clothes in which Jesus had been wrapped; but they withdrew in haste, with mixed and indescribable sensations of fear and joy; and were unable from agitation to communicate their tidings to the disciples if they met them; but they might take another road, (as suggested by Mac knight.) Peter and John, on learning from Mary Magdalene what had happened, hastened to the sepulchre; but the latter outran the former. Still Peter was the first to enter, and examine the inner room, and his example was followed by John; and when that beloved Disciple reflected upon

the orderly manner in which the linen clothes were arranged, faith in his Lord's Resurrection dawned in his breast, and he became entitled to the blessing of those *who have not seen, and yet have believed.* At the same time he candidly acknowledges his slowness of heart, in not understanding from the Scriptures that Christ must rise from the dead. Peter also, we may infer from his second visit, had some hope.

The disciples then *went away again to their home.* Mary Magdalene on her return stood without the tomb, but near it, weeping; and as she stooped down to look into it, she saw two Angels sitting, the one where the head, the other where the feet, of Jesus had lain. Soon after, she turned back, and saw Jesus himself standing, whom she mistook for the gardener, till at the sound of his well-known voice, she recognised him. Her first impulse was to embrace him; but he checked her affectionate desire, by saying, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God.* By the first clause he seems to have meant no more than that she should not then detain him, as she would have other opportunities of seeing him before his ascension; because, soon after, he allowed Salomé and the other Mary and herself to hold him by the feet, and worship him. The latter clause is an allusion to his own words in the last discourse he had had with them, to which none were privy but themselves; and therefore, like the message of the Angel, it offered evidence distinct from the testimony of those who reported it. Jesus next showed himself to her companions, and repeated the Angel's information, that the believers should see him in Galilee, with the endearing substitution for disciples of the word brethren.

146. *The Guard bear testimony before the Rulers to the fact of the Resurrection.* Matt. xxviii. 12—16.

The first party of women were hastening to inform the Apostles, when the soldiers came to the chief priests to exculpate themselves by a confession of the truth. According to Townson, the guard had departed before their arrival. I think, however, that they must have seen them lying in a trance, *like dead men*, for the Angel seems to institute a comparison between them, by saying, *Fear not ye, for I know ye seek Jesus who was crucified.* The Council was immediately summoned, and the result of their deliberation was, to give the soldiers a large sum of money, on the condition that they would spread abroad a rumour, that the disciples of Jesus had come by night, and taken an opportunity to steal away his body while they were fallen asleep. This was to confess a capital offence; a promise therefore was given, that if it should reach the Governor, means should be found to pacify him, and save them from punishment. An impartial hearer would find much in the rumour to excite suspicion. Had such been the intention of the disciples, they might have accomplished it before the watch was set; they were few, friendless, and dispirited, and in expectation of arrest; for when they met together, fear caused them to fasten the doors; the time was the Passover, when the moon was full, and the town was crowded; and the sepulchre was just without the walls, and open to observation. Could the whole guard, probably of sixty men, be sleeping? If asleep, could they be competent witnesses? If awake, could they have been overpowered by men so few and weak, and too poor to bribe them? It might also be asked, Why were not the accused examined, and why was no notice taken of the avowed misconduct of the soldiers? But the Council themselves did not believe the tale, to which they endeavoured to give currency; for when

afterwards the Apostles were brought before them twice, and boldly declared, that him whom they had put to death as a malefactor, God had raised, they did not venture to make this charge. A minute examination of particulars will also show the extreme improbability of the report. A large stone had been rolled to the entrance of the sepulchre, which could not have been removed without noise, and it would have occupied more time than the disciples could spare to put in order the grave-clothes of our Lord, which we conclude was done by the ministering Angels.

147. *The second party of women visit the sepulchre.*
Luke xxiv. 1—12.

Meanwhile a more numerous party of women arrived at the sepulchre, of which Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward, was the principal. The delays incident to their assembling from different houses, and the slowness of their progress with the spices, so retarded them, that the Maries and Salomé were out of sight before their arrival. These too observed that the tomb was open, but did not express any astonishment, supposing that some of their friends had anticipated them, and removed the stone. When, however, upon examination they could no where discover the body, they were perplexed, till two Angels showed themselves, saying, *why seek ye the living among the dead?* reminding them, that the Lord had foretold his Resurrection as well as his Crucifixion. They withdrew to report what they had seen and heard; but, though the other company of women had likewise communicated a message from Angels, so desponding were the Apostles, and so slow to understand the Prophecies, and this their accomplishment, that they believed them not, regarding both accounts as no better than *idle tales*. Still the report had sufficient weight with Peter to make him run a second time to the tomb. The

Angels, however, were not visible to him, and as he saw no more than he had seen upon the first visit, he departed wondering; unable to reconcile the report with appearances, and at a loss what to think, till it pleased Jesus to convince him by appearing. Had his Master shown himself first to any of the other men, Peter might have feared that his repentance was ineffectual, and have sunk into despair. No particulars of this appearance have transpired; but it was the first vouch-safed to *a man*; and we conclude, that it occurred after the two disciples had set out for Emmaus, it being evident that they were ignorant of it till their return.

148. *Christ converses with two of his disciples, who are walking to Emmaus, and after making himself known to them, immediately disappears. Luke xxiv. 13—35.*

The cause of this walk, on a day apparently so inopportune, is not recorded, and we know the name only of one of the two, Cleopas the brother-in-law of the Virgin, and the father of the Apostles James and Jude. Mark^s must allude to it, though he supplies no particulars, when he says, that Jesus *appeared unto two of them as they went into the country*. Mary of Magdala had taken him for the gardener; and as Mark tells us he was in another *form*, μορφὴ, I presume he means *dress*, and he assumed, we may suppose, that of a traveller. They were conversing on the subject nearest their hearts; and that they might open their thoughts more freely, and so afford him a better opportunity for instructing them, *their eyes were holden that they should not know him*. Having interrogated them, he reproved them for want of faith and misconception of the Scriptures; and then, *beginning at Moses*, expounded to them in order the predictions and types *concerning himself*, showing that the Messiah must suffer before he entered into glory. During this conversation they drew nigh to Emmaus, and they, unwilling

^s Mark xvi. 12.

to lose so interesting and edifying a companion, pressed him to stay, observing, that it was advancing towards sunset, and that *the day was far spent*. He yielded to their solicitation, and their frugal meal being ready, blessed the loaf, and gave it to them. His undertaking this office, and performing it in his accustomed manner, probably undeceived them, for they then instantly recognised in this mysterious stranger their lamented Master. He gave them no time to show their feelings, for he vanished out of their sight. The phrase *ἀφαντος ἐγένετο*, which also occurs in the Greek poets and historians, for an abrupt and sudden departure, is rendered in the margin of our translation, *he ceased to be seen of them*; there is therefore no necessity for supposing, with some commentators, that his body was essentially different from what it had been before his resurrection; and we know from his passing unseen through the multitude at Nazareth, that he had possessed previously the power of eluding the sight. Still we are led to conclude from the language used on other occasions, that after his resurrection he was henceforward only visible when he pleased. On missing him, they rose from table, and hastened back to Jerusalem to communicate to the rest the joyful intelligence. They found them privately assembled with the doors bolted, from apprehension of the rulers, apparently after supper; and on gaining admittance, were informed, that *the Lord was risen indeed, and had appeared unto Simon*. They then related his appearance to themselves; and while they were yet speaking, Jesus stood *in the midst of them*, and addressed them with the customary salutation, *Peace be unto you*.

149. *He shows himself the same evening to his Apostles, who, with the exception of Thomas, are assembled together.* Luke xxiv. 36—43. John xx. 21—23.

Their first impression was alarm, for they supposed that it was not himself, but *a spirit*. Several of the Fathers, and some modern commentators, imagine, that the door was still fastened, and that Christ, from becoming visible at pleasure, passed through it. This, however, is not said, nor is it necessary to suppose it, since he could order the door to open, as an Angel did afterwards that of Peter's prison; and the supposition is more in harmony with the economy of miracles so remarkable in the Divine government, which accomplishes by them whatever is needful, but never any thing superfluous. The proof of his resurrection, and the hope of our own, rest upon the identity of his crucified and raised body. This he seemed anxious to demonstrate, by saying, *It is I myself*, and, *a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have*. He offered them all the evidence that could be given; he showed them the marks crucifixion had left upon his hands and feet; he invited them to handle him; he even ate in their presence. To this very evidence St. John appeals in his first Epistle; *we declare unto you that which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life.* And his writing in order to confute the Gnostics, explains why he relates more circumstantially than Luke, the proofs which our Saviour gave of his having resumed the same body. Bishop Horsley supports the contrary opinion, but not, I think, with his usual ability. The only argument appears to be Christ's disappearance at pleasure, and the *assumed* fact, that because it is said the doors had been fastened, he must have passed through them. But the reason assigned by the Evangelist is fear of the Jewish authorities; and they must have been

previously opened to admit the two disciples on their return from Emmaus. Bishop Sherlock even opposes it, as an infidel objection; and the fourth of our XXXIX Articles maintains, that our Lord rose and ascended with the same body, in which he was incarnate, "with flesh, bones, and all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature." Not that the word 'same' is to be interpreted so rigidly as if it underwent no alteration. It is in substance the same; but we learn from the Epistle to the Philippians^h, that it is now *glorious*, and that *the vile body* of his people will hereafter by his energy be *fashioned like unto it*. I only mean, that, however beatified and adapted for higher occupations, it is still, and will ever continue to be, material. He had addressed them, and eaten with them; but not content with appealing to all their senses, as he had expounded the *oracles of God* to the two with whom he had walked, so now he reminded them all that his sufferings had been predicted in the Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets, and *opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures*.

Their joy was now complete, for they could not resist the evidence of their senses. The object, therefore, of Christ being attained, he withdrew; but before he disappeared, he renewed his appointment of them as his ambassadors to the world, and breathed upon them, as a pledge of the promised gift of the Holy Spirit, which they were to receive, in order to qualify them for their commission, the noblest and the most important that had ever been delegated to man. It may also be considered as an earnest actually bestowed for their personal guidance, for henceforward certainly their character is entirely changed, and those who on the arrest of their Master forsook him and fled, met together before the day of Pentecost to fill up their number, in order to qualify themselves for the

^h Philippians iii. 21.

commission conferred on them. The third Person of the holy, glorious, and ever-blessed Trinity, imperceptible to our senses, has been aptly represented by the word which equally answers to spirit, breath, and wind, which is recognised by only one of our senses. Thus did our Lord show himself, four times at least, during that ever-memorable first day of the week, on which, by rising as *the First-born from the dead*, he through death *destroyed him that had the power of death*, bruising the *head*, or vital part of his enemy, who had been only able to bruise his *heel*. *This is*, as the Psalmistⁱ prophesied, preeminently *the day which Jehovah has made*, and Christians should say with him, *we will rejoice and be glad in it*. It has been designated ever since as the Lord's, and has superseded the seventh as the day of public worship, and of rest from secular business and diversion, according to Isaiah's prediction, that *the new creation*, that is, the restoration of man to holiness and the Divine image, procured through the death and resurrection of the Saviour, would be commemorated in preference to that inferior work, the creation of the material world and its inhabitants^k.

150. *After the interval of a week, he appears to all the Eleven; and Thomas, who had not believed the report of the rest, now acknowledges him for his Lord and his God.*
Mark xvi. John xx.

Christ seems to have left his disciples to their own reflections for a week; for it was not till the next Lord's day (to anticipate a term that was soon substituted for that of the first day) that we read of another visit. In the interval, they with Cleopas were no doubt busy in communicating the event to the remaining believers; but they found many of them as little disposed to credit it, as they had them-

ⁱ Psalm cxviii.

^k Isaiah lxv. 17, 18.

selves been. Among these was the Apostle Thomas, whom some unknown cause had kept from their late meeting. Their unanimous assurance of the fact was unavailing; and it is supposed that the resurrection of the body was with him the insuperable objection. "He might deem it not impossible," says Origen¹, "that the soul of a departed person might appear; but he could not believe that Jesus had risen with the same body; and therefore he did not say, Except I shall see *him*, I *shall*^m not believe; but, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and putⁿ my finger on the print of them, and putⁿ my hand upon his side."

The following Sunday morning they were assembled in the same place, and employed the same precaution of fastening the entrance, when Jesus stood in the midst, and saluted them. Then turning to Thomas, who was now with them, he offered him the very criterion he had required; and his speech showed at the same time his knowledge of his incredulity; for he added, *Be not faithless, but believing.* Thomas probably did not stay to make the offered examination; he felt conviction, and addressed Jesus, calling him both his Lord and his God; his Lord who had been crucified, and who by his Resurrection had proved himself to be God. Those who deny our Saviour's Divinity are forced to wrest this reply, as they do other texts from their obvious meaning, and force upon it a sense, which probably few of them know had been brought forward by an early heretic, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and condemned in the

¹ Origen against Celsus, ii.

^m The authorized version *will not believe*, according to the modern use of the tense, conveys not so much the notion of inability, as of unwillingness to believe.

ⁿ Βάλω, in the same verse, is rendered both *put* and *thrust*. The first appears to be most accurate, and εἰπι might as well have been translated *on* as *into*.

fifth General Council, A.D. 553. There are still Christians who say, that it is no more than an exclamation of astonishment, or at most of thanks to the Father; but this does not suit the idiom of the language, which requires it to be an affirmation^o; and the Evangelist informs us, that it was spoken to Jesus, who took it as an acknowledgment of conviction, *Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; happy are they who have not seen, and yet have believed.* A happiness limited at that time to the beloved disciple who records the saying, but modestly leaves it to the reader to apply it. How encouraging has been this declaration to millions, who have since believed upon testimony! and such no doubt it will still prove to a vastly increasing multitude till the second advent of our Lord. It may well check any repining that might arise in the hearts of those who would have delighted to have seen their Saviour in the flesh. And they know that this happiness is not denied to them, it is only deferred, and shall be enjoyed without interruption by all who now believe and obey him, when *they shall see*, as he actually is, him whom now unseen they adore, and faith shall be exchanged for knowledge. It is remarkable that this is the only explicit confession of Christ's proper Divinity from a disciple, and it is not rebuked, but approved.

^o *Thou art* being understood, an ellipsis which is required here as in other passages; for example, in Psalm v. 3. and St. John xiii. 13. Dr. Hales has satisfied me that Middleton errs, with many earlier critics, in maintaining that these nominatives are to be taken as vocatives, because Wetstein has proved that the respective articles of these cases are never confounded.

151. *Jesus shows himself on a mountain in Galilee to the disciples. Matt. xxviii. 16—18. And again on the shore of the lake to seven of them who had been fishing. John xxi. 1—24.*

The next appearance of Christ was not, like the former ones, unexpected, but by appointment. It must have been of great notoriety, and was probably witnessed by all believers who found it practicable to attend. The time is conjectured to have been, like his former visits, a Sunday, and the second after his Resurrection. Matthew, passing over all the former, except the appearance to the women at the sepulchre, directs our attention to this, which is thought to be the one recorded by Paul, at which he tells us, that above five hundred brethren were present; the greater part of whom were alive, when he wrote to the Corinthians^p nearly thirty years after. But what a small company was this, compared with the thousands who must have heard our Lord's discourses, and witnessed his miracles! The spot selected was a mountain in Galilee, according to tradition, Tabor. In that division of Palestine Jesus had principally resided; and at that distance from Jerusalem the disciples might assemble with less fear of the rulers. Here he was seen in an open space and light, and received their homage. Some, we are candidly informed, doubted, but we cannot suppose any of the Eleven, who had been instructed to meet him there; and yet, if we had not St. Paul's additional information, we should have concluded that no other persons were present. The doubters must have been some of the five hundred; yet these too, as he approached, and had a nearer view of him, were convinced. All uncertainty must indeed have ceased, when they heard so well-known a voice reviving their spirits, and

^p 1 Cor. xv. 6.

raising their hopes with these encouraging words, *all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.*

His appearance to seven disciples at the lake of Galilee is placed by some Harmonists before the preceding one, but more probably followed it; for Jesus then apparently took leave of Peter, and the Apostles had returned to their homes and their original occupation. We may naturally place it on the ensuing Sunday, and the day after the Sabbath was one in which there was likely to be a deficiency of provisions. No more than five of the company are named; and if the prevalent opinion, that Nathanael is only another name for Bartholomew, be true, they were all Apostles, and Cleopas will be the only man not of their number who is mentioned as having seen Christ after his Resurrection. It appears to be the object of the Evangelists to fix our attention upon those who were chosen by God to be the witnesses of that fact. Thus when the Eleven assembled immediately after the Ascension to fill up the vacancy occasioned by the death of the traitor Judas, the capability of being a witness of the Resurrection is the point insisted on in his successor; and when Paul, who had not known Christ in the flesh, was to be added to the number as an Apostle, *not by men, but by him and God the Father*, he was favoured with the sight of our Lord in glory, and appeals to the fact as evidence of his Apostleship. *Have I not seen Jesus Christ^q? and, last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time^r.*

The party had been fishing the whole night, but without success. At the dawn of day Jesus was standing on the shore, and asked if they had any fish, as if he had been desirous of becoming a purchaser. He advised them to cast out on the right side; and notwithstanding they did not recognise him, though he addressed them affectionately as dear children, yet they followed his direction; and their

^q 1 Cor. ix. 1.

^r 1 Cor. xv. 8.

compliance was rewarded with so marvellous a quantity, that they could not, from its weight, draw up the net, but were obliged to drag it to land. The number they caught was a hundred and fifty-three large fishes, and the sale of them would contribute to their temporary support. There must have been a reason for this specification, which no commentator seems to have ascertained. The explanation most satisfactory to my mind is the suggestion, that, as it appears from Oppian's Poem on Fishing that this was the precise number of species then known, the enumeration was designed to indicate, that in their new vocation, the Apostles should catch men of all nations, ranks, and characters. The beloved disciple, astonished at this wonderful draught, and recollecting the similar one which had preceded their call to a regular attendance on Jesus, exclaimed, *It is the Lord!* It is natural that such success, after a night of unproductive toil, should recall to the recollection of the beloved disciple that memorable draught, which led to his giving up his occupation at the bidding of Jesus, and becoming his regular follower. It is interesting to notice the differences as well as the resemblance in these miracles, as in the twice feeding with an inadequate supply of provisions a multitude in a desert. Augustine* discovers a symbolical meaning in almost every particular. We may not be satisfied with all the details of his interpretation, yet it is edifying to consider the spiritual improvement which he imagines it was designed that we should draw out of them. In the first draught, he sees a figure of the Church as it now is; in the second, its condition at the end of the dispensation. In the first, they *enclosed a great multitude of fishes, and their net brake;* so all were not secured within them. In the second, the hundred fifty and three were large; and for all there were so many, yet was not the net

* As quoted from various passages in Trench's Notes on the Miracles.

broken. Then the Apostles *filled both the ships*, still on the troubled lake; now *Simon Peter drew the net to land*, on the safe shore of eternity. There a great multitude was caught, as in the draught of the Parable^t, *of every kind*, of which *the bad*, that is, those not fit for food, representing the unworthy members of the visible Church, *they cast away*; here the hundred and fifty-three designate the fixed definite number of the elect. Upon John's exclaiming, *It is the Lord!* Peter lept into the lake, that he might be the first to salute him; and his accustomed eagerness was probably stimulated by the desire of confessing his sin, and thanking his Master for forgiving him. Still in his haste he did not forget to mark respect, by putting on his upper tunic, which he had thrown off as well as his cloak^u. On the shore they found a fire already kindled; fish broiling, and bread provided. The stranger ordered them to bring some of the fish now taken, and invited them to break their fast, when he was recognised as at Emmaus in the act of dividing the loaf. Peter's case required especial notice, that he and future believers might derive benefit from his fall and recovery. When forewarned by his Master, that notwithstanding his declaration, *I am ready to go with thee into*

^t Matt. xiii. 47.

^u Τυπυὸς, *naked*, like our *undressed* and *dressed*, is not to be taken literally here, or in the narratives of the young man who fled from the soldiers, Mark xiv. 51.; of Saul prophesying before Samuel, 1 Sam. xix. 24.; or of the command to Isaiah to walk three years barefoot and *naked*, xx. 1, 2. This word and the corresponding *nudus* are used in the same manner by Greek and Roman authors. Cincinnatus was found *naked* at the plough, Plin. xviii. 4.; and Plutarch says of Phocion, that in the country he always went *naked*. And the truth of this interpretation is proved by a passage from Eusebius, Ecc. Hist. vi. 39. in which Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, in the description of his escape from persecution, says, “I was *naked* in a linen garment.”

prison and to death, he should thrice deny that he even knew him; he with his constitutional ardour and vehemence had replied, *Although all shall be offended, yet will not I*. Jesus, to humble and to prove him, now enquired if he loved him more than these did, whom he had chosen to be his Apostles as well as him; and as he had thrice denied, the question was put to him thrice*. Peter's failure had subdued his confidence; and he was consequently now content with declaring that he loved his Master, without drawing an invidious comparison between his own affection and that of the rest. Each time Jesus answered, *Tend my sheep*, or, *Feed my lambs*; and the verbs he uses, seem to mean both government and instruction. We learn from the question and reply, that Love to the Saviour is the grand indispensable qualification required in Ministers of the Gospel; and that the proper evidence of this love is care of the flock committed to their charge^y. The charge was here given exclusively to Peter; and from it Bellarmine deduces the doctrine, that he and his reputed successors were thereby commissioned to govern not the laity only, but also the whole clergy. Had such been his Master's design, surely he would have said, *Tend my sheep, Tend my shepherds*, instead of naming sheep and lambs; the distinction not being between the clergy and the laity, but the young and old disciples, the advanced and the inexperi-

* Whitby's interpretation, *Lovest thou me more than these*—boats and nets? that is, “wouldest thou rather pursue thy business or mine, wouldest thou rather catch fish than men?” is a sense that ought no doubt to be ever present to the mind of a minister, but it is not so suitable to the context as the more obvious one, *Lovest thou me more than these do*.

^y The two Greek verbs, which mean to love, are used, but they appear to be in this place synonymous; and the Syriac version, which comes nearer even than the original to the actual words of our Lord, has only one.

enced believers. Such an interpretation is also at variance with the inspired testimony of him to whom the charge was addressed; who^z exhorts elders, not as Pastor of Pastors, or Vicar of Christ, but as being *also an Elder*; and reminds them of their duty, in the same words in which he had been himself reminded; *Tend the flock of God*, acknowledging at the same time none but his Master to be *Chief Shepherd*. Peter, mortified at the repetition of the question, appealed to his Master's omniscience, *Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee*. If the charge detached from the context should appear ambiguous, it will be made clear by these words of St. Peter's Epistle, and other texts in the New Testament bearing upon the point. From them we may confidently affirm, that these three repetitions of the commission, instead of augmenting his dignity, did no more than reinstate him in his apostleship. And this he might fear he had forfeited, since he had not only like the rest deserted, but actually denied his Master. Jesus then prepared him to expect and *endure hardness* as his faithful and *good soldier*, and to prove his love not by labours and privations solely, but even by death; and this the Evangelist calls, as Jesus at the Passover had done his own, his glorifying God, a term which we may suppose that the Church adopted from this passage, when its writers applied it to other martyrdoms. In figurative language, drawn probably from the action of his Apostle, who had so lately girded himself, and walked whither he would (to meet his Master), Christ intimated that he should die by crucifixion, when another should gird him, and carry him whither (according to flesh and blood, yet not by deliberate preference) he would not. Walking on a little, Jesus called upon Peter to follow, that by so doing, he might signify his willingness to be conformed to him in his sufferings. Peter, in his first Epistle,

^z 1 Pet. v. 1—4.

written perhaps about thirty years later, to the brethren then *in heaviness through manifold temptations*, tells them, that they were called to suffer, *because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that they should follow his steps*; and now he literally walked in his Master's steps, to show his willingness to do what his walking typified. His martyrdom appears to be here referred to by St. John as a past event; and he is supposed himself to allude to this obscure prediction of it, when he declares in his second Epistle, that the Lord Jesus Christ had showed him that he must shortly put off his tabernacle^a. Peter obeyed: and John, without waiting for a command, followed of his own accord, expressively, yet modestly, showing his readiness uncalled, to prove his love by a painful and ignominious death. This led Peter to enquire concerning the lot that awaited John, but Jesus did not think fit to gratify his curiosity, and the question might have been dictated by some dissatisfaction, that an easier termination of life seemed to be assigned to his friend. The answer evaded the question, and was misconceived; for as John long outlived the destruction of Jerusalem, to which the phrase of the Lord's coming is often applied, and was far advanced in years when he wrote his Gospel, a notion prevailed that he was never to die; but the words seem to mean no more than that in opposition to Peter's violent end, his departure out of life should be calm and peaceable. It might have been added afterwards in what we may call a second edition of his Gospel. Grotius supposes that the whole chapter was written by another John, under the sanction of the Elders of Ephesus. Hammond and others are content with assigning to them the clause, *This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and we know that his testimony is true*; because it concludes with the plural number. Yet the difficulty is not thus removed, for

^a 2 Pet. i. 14.

the singular immediately follows. *There are also many other things which Jesus did, which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.* It is also natural to ask, what weight can an anonymous *we* confer upon the testimony of a personal witness, even if we knew it to stand for Presbyters who had not witnessed the scene, and were not likely to have heard, except from St. John himself, of an event which had occurred in a distant country long before. It is much more reasonable to suppose, that the Evangelist by *we*, as well as *I*, only designates himself, this interchange of pronouns having been common at all times; and he himself, for example, making our Lord use both in his conversation with Nicodemus, *Verily, verily I say unto thee, we speak that we know.* Some commentators, though they allow the truth of the narrative, do not believe it to have been written by the Evangelist. In support of their hypothesis, they are pleased to treat it as not of sufficient importance to have been recorded by an inspired author; yet this, which appears to be an after-thought, seems to be a presumptuous judging of what Scripture ought to contain; and surely we cannot allow a section to be insignificant, which contains both the only miracle our Lord wrought after his Resurrection, and the prophecy of the lot of the two most eminent of his Apostles.

St. Paul^b is our authority for an appearance to James, which he interposes between that to the great body of believers, and the final one to the Apostles. He does not specify to which of the two that bore the name, but it is generally supposed not to John's brother, whom *Herod slew with the sword*, but to the son of Alphæus, who when he wrote was presiding over the Church of Jerusalem. Others, which are not recorded, might have been granted in the interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension; and

^b 1 Cor. xv. 7.

St. John seems to intimate that they were, when immediately after the speech to Thomas^c, he adds, *many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book.* He ends his Gospel with a similar observation^d: and it seems most reasonable to refer the last statement to the whole course of his ministry, and this to the period after the Resurrection, especially as he adds, *in the presence of his disciples.* The language of the Acts favours this conclusion. *To whom he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty dayse.* Certainly but few of these visits are recorded; those only, it is suggested by West, which answered the purpose of their conviction, and are enough for ours; the others being for their instruction in the faith.

Be this however as it may, and satisfactory as the evidence afforded was, it was afforded only to friends; as St. Peter candidly states^f, *Him hath God shown openly, not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God.* It may be, and has been asked, why was he not shown to all, if the identity of his person would stand the test. The most incredulous of his enemies had declared that they would believe in him, if they might but see him descend from the cross; and would they not much more have believed, had they seen him the third day risen from the grave? In such a case, the choice of witnesses may be thought to bring a suspicion on their testimony, a surmise that they were chosen not by God, but by themselves and their confederates. This objection, an obvious one, which has been repeated by modern infidels, did not escape Celsus, the earliest opponent of Christianity. Though plausible, it will be found upon examination to be of no weight; for those to whom Jesus was personally known, were the only competent witnesses of his identity, and their number was quite sufficient; for

^c John xx. 30.

^d John xxi. 25.

^e Acts i. 3.

Acts x. 40.

the fact does not rest upon the testimony of the eleven Apostles, or of Paul^s, but on that of five hundred brethren, most of whom were alive many years after. Even the evidence, which unbelievers call for, might not have answered the purpose, for it is well known how much the understanding is under the influence of the inclination; and in vain had a succession of miracles (among them the restoration to life of Lazarus) been exhibited as signs, to those who were unwilling to believe. Had the evidence amounted to demonstration; had the fact of the Resurrection been made as certain to their conviction as the presence of the sun to their eyes, according to the arrogant and absurd demand of a modern infidel; none truly could have contradicted it, but none (accurately speaking) could have *believed*, for they must have *known it*, and certainty would have extinguished faith. To our Lord's contemporaries, then, overpowering and irresistible evidence would have of necessity done away the moral nature of their assent, while to many of subsequent times, the national reception of this truth would have been a stumbling-block, for it would have been easy for Celsus and other adversaries to have represented it as “a state trick, ■ Jewish fable, a mere political contrivance.”

There was, however, another reason, which has not been sufficiently noticed, but on which alone Origen rests his reply—the unsuitableness of this demand, constituting a moral impossibility. *Happy are the pure in heart, for they shall see God*, said our Lord; and to them alone, after the triumph of our incarnate Deity over death and hell and *him who had the power of death*, was this high privilege vouchsafed. Our Lord, therefore, now recompensed as Mediator with all power in heaven and on earth, could not renew with the world the familiar intercourse of the Son of Man. The atonement once made, the *form of a servant* was to

cease. Christ was to resume his glory, and to be seen no more except as *the Only-begotten of the Father*. His appearance, accordingly, after the Resurrection, was a favour granted to friends, and justly withheld from the nation, who, by their rejection of their Messiah, had proved themselves unworthy of such an honour. He had solemnly taken leave of them on quitting for the last time the Temple, when he declared that they should not see him again, till they were disposed to acknowledge him as their King. He now opened ■ new commission, addressed to the whole world, and that once opened, there was no ground to demand special and particular evidence to them^h. The world, he had told the Apostles, should see him no more; *but I will see you again; your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you*. Still it was a joy tempered with reverence; there was now a more reserved dignity in his deportment, on their part a more humble and less familiar intercourse. He appeared to them, and even ate with them, but it was no longer a social meal; it was for the purpose of convincing them, that though restored to life, he had still a real body, for his time was no longer passed as heretofore in their society; they knew not his goings out and his comings in, and none of them, for instance, could say to Thomas as Nathanael did formerly to Philip, *Come and see*. On the journey to Galilee, he was not their companion, but went before them; they were not to seek him at Capernaum, his former abode in that province, but at a mountain where Jesus had appointed them; and when they saw him, they did not address him as heretofore, but worshipped himⁱ.

^h Sherlock's Trial of the Witnesses.

ⁱ Bishop Horsley, Sermon xiv. on the Evidences of our Lord's Resurrection.

152. *He instructs his Apostles, who had now returned to Jerusalem, to preach repentance and remission of sins to all nations, and to baptize them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.* Matthew xxviii. 19, 20. *Mark xvi. 16—18. Luke xxiv. 44—48. Acts i. 1—9.*

The first message of Jesus to the Apostles after the Resurrection was, to order them to go into Galilee. When in Galilee, he must have commanded them to return to Jerusalem, for it was in the capital that he took leave of them. At this last meeting, having opened their understandings that they might comprehend the prophecies concerning himself, he commanded that *repentance and remission of sins should be proclaimed in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem*, and that *they should make disciples of them, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*; that is, into a religion, the characteristic tenet of which is belief in the existence, offices, and operations of the Three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity, as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles, that, though he had spoken to them so often *concerning the things pertaining to the kingdom of God*, they were still under the delusion that he was about to commence his reign, and to seat himself on the throne of his father David; for they asked, *Wilt thou, Lord, at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?* His reply conveyed not the information they sought, but a reproof; *It is not for you to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.* It should be noted, that though he checked their wish to pry into futurity, he does not disclaim the sovereignty of Israel. Other work was prepared for them than filling offices under a temporal sovereign; they were, like him, to

suffer, and to collect out of Jews and Gentiles a people who should be prepared to serve him at his second coming. Yet, that they might not be discouraged, he subjoined a promise, well fitted to comfort them, *Ye shall receive miraculous power after the Holy Ghost is come upon you;* and he contrasted the inferior Baptism of John *by water* with the Christian *by the Holy Ghost,* to intimate its immeasurable superiority.

This *power from on high* had been already bestowed upon the Twelve, and even upon the Seventy during their preparatory missions. The gift is now renewed, and this *promise of the Father* of the Holy Ghost in his extraordinary operations is thus particularized by St. Mark: *These signs shall follow them that believe:*

In my Name they shall cast out devils.

They shall speak with new tongues.

They shall take up serpents.

And if they drink any deadly draught, it shall not hurt them.

They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

And in the original commission were what he has omitted,

Cleanse the lepers, and Raise the dead.

Mark concludes his gospel with informing us, that *they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.* St. Paul subdivides some of these gifts and adds others, when he enumerates to the Corinthians^k, 1. *the word of wisdom;* 2. *the word of knowledge;* 3. *faith;* 4. *the gifts of healing;* 5. *the working of miracles;* 6. *prophecy;* 7. *discerning of spirits;* 8. *divers kinds of tongues;* and, 9. *the interpretation of them:* and at the close of the chapter he specifies those to whom *that one and the selfsame Spirit divided them severally as he willed: first, Apostles; secondarily, Prophets; thirdly, Teachers; after that, 4. Miracles; then, 5. Gifts of healing; 6. Helps; 7. Governments; 8. Diver-*

^k 1 Cor. xii.

sities of tongues. Of these gifts the last is the most impressive, because it acts equally upon a whole assembly, as was seen on the day of Pentecost, and does not admit of being counterfeited, but our Lord had never need of it, for, as a *Minister of the circumcision*, and sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, he never went beyond the limits of the Holy Land. Such credentials were indispensable on the introduction of a new religion, opposed to the feelings and prejudices of all mankind, and hostile alike to the superstition, power, knowledge, and philosophy of the age; but they are no longer needed, when power, knowledge, and philosophy, have passed over to Christianity; and Missionaries can appeal to the miracles preserved in the written word in successive generations, which ushered in the new Dispensation, as it had the Mosaic, and which have convinced thousands, and triumphed over the attacks of Sophists and Scorners. The Romanist indeed maintains, that the gift of Miracles is one of the notes of a true Church; and in conformity with this view, the Pope from time to time canonizes those in whose favour evidence of this test of being Saints is proved to the satisfaction of the appointed judges. The miracles, however, which they adduce are of a very different character from those recorded in the Scriptures. Like those of the apocryphal gospels, they are objectionable, or at best frivolous, carrying with them their own confutation; and even when of an edifying character, (which is not the rule but the exception,) we should anticipate from them not benefit, but injury to religion, as their tendency would be to encourage spiritual pride, by unduly exalting the persons so favoured in the estimation of themselves and others. In countries where Christianity already prevails, there appears to be no adequate reason for their continuance. The Apostle himself, as eminent in these gifts as in the natural qualifications for his office, when he tells the Corinthians, that *tongues are for*

a sign to them that believe not, leads us to the conclusion, that miraculous gifts granted to the first preachers of the Gospel to cooperate with them, would be withdrawn as soon as preachers could prevail without them. Whatever be the reason, we know it as a fact, from the confession of Xavier the Jesuit, who has been called “the Apostle of the Indies,” and the testimony of Protestant propagators of the Faith in Africa, India, and the islands of the Pacific Ocean, that this supernatural aid is no longer granted. And the modern Missionary, who having attained, not by intuition, but by diligent study, a foreign tongue, preaches to an attentive congregation of New Zealanders, whom he found cannibals, or to the Hindoos of Chrishnagar or Tinnevelly, who lately worshipped “stocks and stones,” has no need to regret that miraculous power has been denied to him, since the conversion of fierce savages and haughty Brahmins into humble and moral Christians, without the aid of these extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, will bring others to *worship God, and to report that God is in them of a truth.* Our own ancestors, and the other northen nations, whether of Gothic or Slavonic origin, have been converted within the period of authentic history by zealous preachers, who had no attainments of a higher nature than those possessed by our own Clergy, and were not only destitute of the many advantages which increasing civilization has given the latter, but had no Bible to communicate to their converts, or to strengthen and purify their own faith. Miracles, I apprehend, had ceased when Tertullian, in his Apology in the third century, could write, “We are but of yesterday, and yet we crowd your cities, we garrison your forts, fight in your armies, fill your provinces, throng your assemblies, and swarm in all the divisions of this metropolis; we abound in the court, in the camp, in the forum, in the senate-house. In short, we leave you only your temples. We could ruin you only by dividing from you, and retiring into some remote corner of the world:” and even there,

he might have added, we should find brethren; for Justin Martyr, about a century and a half before, had declared that there were no people, not even those ignorant of agriculture and dwelling in tents, among whom prayers were not offered up in the name of the crucified Jesus to the Father and Creator of all. And yet these gifts, when poured out in full abundance upon the Church, were not so efficacious as many have imagined. Addressed not to the reason but to the senses, they served indeed to secure attention, and subdued some rougher minds inaccessible to the winning eloquence of heavenly Truth. They accomplished the conversion of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, but it was only in part; for though these were *amazed* by the believers speaking in languages previously unknown to them, they were also *pricked in their heart* by the matter of Peter's discourse. An earthquake so great, that the foundations of the prison were shaken, brought the jailor of Philippi trembling to Paul, to ask, *What must I do to be saved?* and Paul himself had been struck down to the earth by a *light from heaven*; but the Beræans *received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so*, without any miracle. The Treasurer of Queen Candace was convinced by the interpretation of Isaiah's celebrated prediction; and Lydia's *heart the Lord opened, and she attended to the things* (not done, but) *spoken by Paul*. Those who are disposed to attribute the whole success of the Apostles to their supernatural endowments, and in consequence to underrate, and by their representations dishearten, modern Missionaries, should weigh these instances, and consider the contrast that the New Testament exhibits to us in the churches of Rome and Corinth. The latter, so abundant in these powers, required to be controlled by the Apostle, lest in their assemblies unbelievers should say they were mad; and they were *carnal, having envying and strife, and were puffed up*, though they tolerated in their communion a member guilty

of such sin as was not so much as named among the Gentiles. The former, to whom no spiritual gift had been imparted, had its *faith spoken of throughout the whole world*. These miraculous gifts appear to have been gradually withdrawn, and there has been much discussion respecting the period when they ceased; but to me it seems most reasonable to suppose, that though granted by the Holy Spirit in the first age to men and women, the Apostles alone had the privilege of communicating them to others. Adopting this conclusion, it could have outlasted the first age only by a single generation, and we may, in the language of Gibbon¹, limit this gift of supernatural powers to "that happy period of the primitive Church, comparatively exempt from error and deceit," the age of the Apostles, and of the first succession of Apostolical Fathers.

Our Missionaries should remember, that *Baptism* as well as *Teaching* was comprehended in the original commission to the Apostles. Roman Catholic Priests have been accused (and I believe justly) of administering this Sacrament hastily and indiscreetly, and so of having introduced unworthy members into the Church; it may be feared that our Ministers, from anxiety to avoid this serious evil, have been too slow to admit their converts to all the privileges of believers. Baptism would of course entitle the catechumen to partake of "the Holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ;" and without considering the benefits we might expect them to derive from these "sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good will," a formal and public renunciation of idolatry and declaration of their belief, must have a natural tendency to strengthen their conviction, and to preserve them from relapsing into heathenism. Certainly the converts of the Apostles passed at once from conviction to Baptism. The converts of the day of Pentecost, before that day had closed, had sealed by

¹ Chap. xv.

this pledge their adherence to their new faith. The Eunuch pressing for Baptism, was assured that he might immediately be admitted by it into covenant with God, if he believed with all his heart that Jesus the Christ was the Son of God; and the Jailor of Philippi heard but one discourse, and that probably not a long one, when he was baptized, *he and all his straightway.*

153. *The Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ into Heaven, and his sitting down there on the right hand of God.*
Mark xvi. 19. Luke xxiv. 50—53. Acts i. 4—11.

Jesus had now fulfilled the object of his mission. He had offered himself upon the cross as the perfect and sufficient propitiatory sacrifice for sin, *having nailed to it the handwriting of ordinances that was against us*, and having triumphed on it over death, and him who had the power of death, that is, the Devil. As he exclaimed, *It was finished*, yet he was pleased to remain on earth forty days, that he might give his disciples time and opportunity to assure themselves of the fulfilment of his declaration in his prayer, *I have glorified thee upon earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.* There was no reason, therefore, why he should prolong his stay, and it was necessary, that, as *our High Priest*, he should *enter into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us*, and to seat himself on his mediatorial throne. He had also, *having spoiled principalities and powers, to lead captivity captive, and to receive for men the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit*, to enable the Apostles to establish Christianity, and the ordinary but more precious ones for the personal edification of believers in all generations. He had both before and since his death forewarned them of his departure; and lest they might suppose, when they heard of his resurrection, that he meant to associate with them as formerly, he sent this

message to them by Mary Magdalene, *I ascend unto my Father, and my God.*

He therefore now led them out to their accustomed place of resort, the mount of Olives, and, proceeding as far as Bethany, blessed them. In the act of blessing, a cloud received him out of their sight, and he ascended, as he had declared he should, when *he had by himself purged our sins*, into heaven, there to *sit down at the right hand of the Majesty on high*, till the prophecy be fulfilled^a, that *Jehovah shall make his enemies his footstool*. It appears from Mark and Luke, the only Evangelists that record the Ascension, that Jesus was passive in the act, consequently that it was effected by the Father. It was not sudden, but gradual, the disciples having full leisure^b to observe it. The resurrection, whereby *he was declared to be the Son of God with power*, required not to be seen, because *he showed himself alive, after his passion, by many infallible proofs*; but it was desirable that he should ascend in the sight of all the Apostles, because they would see him on earth no more, and could have no other evidence of the fact, while they continued below.

The different manner in which the writers of the New Testament refer to these two stages in our Redeemer's triumph is striking. I know no work in which the contrast is so fully brought out, as in a Village Sermon of our Regius Professor of Divinity; and I introduce from it a few sentences, which will have the more weight with many of the readers of these Lectures, as they are the remarks of one, to whose instructions in Theology as well as in Classical Literature the Undergraduates of Magdalene Hall have for many years been deeply indebted.

"There are few things more remarkable, more entirely different from what we, beforehand, should naturally have expected in the Gospel History, than the way in which the

^a Psalm cx.

^b Dick on the Acts.

Ascension is spoken of. We should have looked, after the sufferings and shame to which Christ was pleased to submit had been so fully and so particularly told, that the triumph in which all this ended would have been dwelt upon at great length. But what do we really find to be the case? The cross which he endured, the shame which he despised, of these we are told much; but of *the joy that was set before him*, we hear very little, or rather, may we not say, in comparison we hear nothing? Of the four Gospels which the Holy Ghost caused to be written for the use of the Church, two, those of St. Matthew and St. John, make no mention at all of the Ascension. The other two Evangelists do indeed mention the fact; but that is all that we can say. They dismiss it in a single verse; and in the Acts of the Apostles^r, we shall find one notice more of it from the pen of St. Luke; but this, again, is as short, as void of any feeling like joy, or pride, or triumph, as words could possibly be. How different is it, when we read of Elijah the prophet^q being taken up! There we have much excitement and eagerness of feeling on the part of the sons of the prophets, first at Bethel, and then at Jericho: we have the waters of Jordan divided for Elijah and his successor Elisha to go over on dry ground: we have a chariot of fire, and horses of fire; and Elijah goes up by a whirlwind into Heaven! Can we account for this difference, which at first sight seems so surprising? We can. Surely we have here one instance more of the way in which the Godhead of our Saviour is taken for granted throughout the whole Gospel History. Had Jesus Christ been less than divine, his being taken up into Heaven must have claimed a fuller and a more emphatic account; but being, as he was, "very God of very God," his going back to his former glory, when his work on earth was done, was in truth a matter of course. And accordingly, the sacred Historians either do not mention it

▪ Acts i. 9.

^q 2 Kings ii.

at all, or speak of it most slightly. But think for a moment of the very different way in which his Resurrection is spoken of. St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, all tell of this, and all more or less at length. And if you take the other books of the New Testament, you will find the writers constantly referring to Christ's rising again from the dead, though they speak so little and so seldom of his going up into heaven. It is as witnesses of the Resurrection that they describe themselves: it was in this capacity that they deemed it necessary to fill up the place from which Judas by transgression fell. Accordingly, of Christ's rising again they speak whenever opportunity offers: to his Ascension they very seldom call the attention. Once believe the birth of Christ, and his death, and you cannot imagine any other end to his work on earth than his going up again into Heaven. The Resurrection was the great point to dwell upon, in order to show that his manhood triumphed over death, that his human soul was not left in the unseen world among ordinary spirits, neither did his sacred body see that corruption which is the common lot of "all who are naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam." But the Ascension followed of course. His Godhead carried back to its own high and holy seat the veil of flesh, under which he had been pleased for a time to shroud its glories¹."

A human body is prevented by its gravity from rising into the air; but the universal principle of attraction which pervades all matter was either now suspended, or had ceased to affect that of the Saviour, which might as he ascended undergo its change, and put on immortality, becoming *spiritual* and *glorious*, such as by his Almighty energy he shall render, in due time, the *natural* and *vile bodies* of all who shall hereafter, in answer to his prayer, be with him *where he is, and shall behold and share his glory.*

¹ Jacobson's Sermons, 2d. edit. p. 89—94.

The Apostles gazed intently and *stedfastly* upon their ascending Lord, *passing into the heavens*, till a cloud received him out of their sight; when two angels, standing by them in white apparel, assured them, that as they had seen *this same Jesus taken up* from them, so he would in like manner visibly descend, to be seen, not as then, by a select few, but by the whole human race, who, beside the comparatively few whom the Lord shall find at his coming, shall be raised from the grave. He will then *himself descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, with the trump of God, to be glorified by his saints*, that is, his Angels, and admired by all that believe. The Eleven worshipped him as their God, (for though the word be equivocal, there can be no doubt, after all that had passed, that it is here used in the sense of adoration,) and then *returned to Jerusalem*, not in sorrow on account of this separation, but *in great joy, and were continually in the Temple, praising and blessing God*; for all their doubts had vanished, their prejudices had been subdued, and they were at length satisfied that it was far better for them that Jesus should be their Intercessor and Sovereign in heaven, than their Companion and Teacher, or even King upon earth. We have no reason to suppose that they saw him any more, till they themselves were removed in due time from this state of trial, except John, to whom he appeared at Patmos, as the Priest of his Church; and no subsequent appearances of our Redeemer are on record, except that to the first Martyr Stephen, and those to the Apostle of the Gentiles. He had previously told them, that it *was expedient for them that he should go away; for if he went not away, the Holy Spirit, with his precious gifts, would not be sent to them*; and while the Holy Spirit was to be their Advocate upon earth, he was himself to be their Advocate in heaven; for thus only could he complete his offices, as their Prophet, King, and Priest. On his ascension he was *made*, in his human

nature, *Head over all things*, for the government of his people, having obtained *gifts* for them, *for the building up of his Church*. On earth he had expiated our sins, by his sacrifice of himself: but the intercessory part of the Priest's office could only be performed in heaven. As that functionary under the law brought the blood of the sin-offering into the *holy of holies*, so it was necessary that he, the substance of that shadow, should enter into his Father's presence, *the true tabernacle*, of which the *earthly* one was but a type, there to plead the efficacy of his merits for his people.

Thus terminates the history of our Incarnate Saviour upon earth; and the arrangement of it in one continuous narrative, exhibits in his discourses and actions an unity of design, which might not strike so forcibly an ordinary reader of the four Gospels. His human character, as it results from the account of his inspired biographers, (for they have not formally drawn it,) is peculiar to himself, as he alone, whether considered as a man or as a teacher, *did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth*. His whole life was *holy, harmless, undefiled*, but he was not only negatively good, as might be supposed of one who had no taint of original sin, but preeminent in positive virtue, he was perfect in conversation and in action; for his countrymen exclaimed in admiration, *Never man spake as this Man*, and, *he has done all things well*; and *his example is justly held forth to us, that we should follow his steps*. The more we study this example, the more perfect will it appear, but study it requires; for strange as the remark may seem, perfect virtue, from its very excellence, being less easy to be understood till it is closely studied, will not produce so deep an impression as when alloyed; for men are apt to applaud the splendid excess of any quality rather than the accurate mean between that and defect.

In^s the history of the illustrious we can in general readily trace their preeminent qualities. But in the character of Christ, though a character positively great, as well as unexceptionably pure, no quality predominates. The virtues are all so harmoniously blended, that as the prismatic rays, till broken by art, cannot be detected in the pure light formed by their union, so in his character, the whole of the colouring disappears; the virtues are simply and uniformly luminous.

Never to have committed the least fault, and never to have uttered a word that could be justly condemned, and that during a life passed in action, and exposed to continual temptation, evinces a perfection beyond the reach of man. To this evidence as undenial, Jesus himself appealed before all the people in the Temple^t; *Which of you convicteth me of sin? and if [in making this affirmation] I speak the truth, why do ye not believe me?* Such a character being above the nature of men, could not have been invented by one; and even Rousseau^u writes, “Never could Jewish authors have invented this tone of character or this morality; and the Gospel has marks of veracity so great, so striking, and so perfectly inimitable, that the hero of it would be more astonishing than the inventor.” How unaccountable, that conceding so much, he does not concede all! he suspends his belief, though, on his own showing, the conclusion follows, that the Gospel narrative must be an accurate transcript from a true original, and that Jesus of Nazareth must have actually lived, and spoken, and acted as he is described to have done. His character,

^s These observations are taken from the fifth Discourse of Penrose's Banton Lectures for 1808, entitled, “An Attempt to prove the Truth of Christianity from the Wisdom displayed in its Original Establishment;” in which Christ's wisdom is contrasted with the craft of the founders of false religions, and of the unworthy propagators of the true.

^t John viii. 46.

^u Emile, ii. p. 85.

superior to that of the ideal sage of the Stoics and the just man of the Platonists, has been admired even by those who reject his authority, and has extorted from the same infidel, in an eloquent parallel, the memorable though inconsistent confession, that if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God. A distinguished writer of our own days observes, that "his^x character was made up of contrasts; in other words, that it was an union of excellences not easily reconciled, at first sight incongruous, yet which, when duly proportioned, constitute moral harmony, and attract with equal power, love, and veneration. We discover in Jesus Christ an unparalleled dignity of character, a consciousness of greatness not discovered in any other individual; and yet this was blended with a condescension, lowliness, and unostentatious simplicity, which had never before been thought consistent with greatness. He united an utter superiority to the world, to its pleasures and ordinary interests, with suavity of manners, and freedom from austerity. He joined strong feeling and self-possession; an indignant sensibility to sin, and compassion to the sinner; an intense devotion to his work, and calmness under opposition and ill success; an universal philanthropy, and a susceptibility of private attachments; the authority which became the Saviour of the world, and the tenderness and the gratitude of a Son. The most striking trait," adds Dr. Channing, "was undoubtedly Benevolence; and although this virtue had existed before, yet it had not been manifested in the same form and extent. This Benevolence was distinguished, first, by its love to man as man, a love comprehending, in its expansiveness, the hated Samaritan, and the despised Publican. Another characteristic of it was, its gentleness and tenderness, forming a strong contrast with the hardness and ferocity of the spirit and manners which then prevailed, and with that

^x On the Evidences of the Christian Religion, p. 217, 218.

sternness and inflexibility, which the purest philosophy of Greece and Rome inculcated as the perfection of virtue. But its most distinguishing trait was its superiority to injury. This form of benevolence, the most disinterested and divine, was manifested by him in infinite strength amidst injuries and indignities which could not be surpassed. While all other men are formed in a measure by the spirit of their age, we can discover in Jesus no impression of the period in which he lived. His history shows him to us as a solitary being, living for purposes which none but himself comprehended, and enjoying not so much as the sympathy of a single mind^t. Now this superiority, to the degrading influences of the age under which all other men suffered, needs to be explained. Such was the Author of our religion. Does not his character bear the unambiguous marks of a *heavenly origin^u?*" Such is the question of Dr. Channing. Surely we may say in reply to this advocate of the Saviour's simple humanity, that in the perfect human character thus pourtrayed, he unconsciously supplies the best refutation of his own *God-denying* apostasy^x; and at the same time excites our amazement, that

^t On the Evidences of the Christian Religion, p. 212.

^u Evidences, p. 218.

^x Such is the emphatic epithet with which Eusebius brands Unitarianism, which he designates in the same chapter (E. Hist. v. 28.) as **a** blasphemous false speaking. It requires but a very little acquaintance with Christian Antiquity to know, that Priestley and his school could find no support to this their scheme, except from authors whom the early Church condemned as heretical. But I am induced to translate from this chapter a few sentences which briefly trace its origin, and notice its condemnation, by the orthodox of early times. "They might perhaps seem to say something credible, if first of all the Divine Scriptures did not oppose them; and there are certain writings older than Victor, (Bishop of Rome, A.D. 193,) which they wrote to the Gentiles in defence of the truth, and against the heresies then prevailing. I mean Justin, A.D. 167, Miltiades, Tatian, and Clemens, in all of which Christ is represented as God. Who is ignorant of the books of Irenæus, Melito, and the rest

one who believed the miracles and divine mission of Christ, could suppose that the character which he himself delineates, and which he maintains is *of heavenly origin*, could belong to one who in his estimation was a mere Man, instead of *the Lord from heaven*.

Even the Unitarian Christian, while he discards the peculiar doctrines which alone make Christianity *good tidings of great joy*, hath still an incalculable advantage over all who draw their rules of life from the imperfect conduct of fallible men, or the unauthoritative deductions of reason, because, in the *Author and Finisher of his faith*, he has both a perfect teacher, and a perfect example of morality. It is, however, to be lamented, beyond the reach of language to express, that any who bear the *holy name by which we are called* should rest in this inadequate conception of their obligations to him, and while they profess to honour him as their guide, should, though it be unconsciously, *deny the Lord who bought them*. May it please our heavenly Father for his sake to remove from the hearts of all such the veil which conceals his glory, that they may believe with the Catholic Church, in every country and in every age, that Jesus is “very God” as well as “very Man,” and is, by his twofold nature as “one Christ,” entitled and

announcing Christ to be God and Man? How many psalms and odes, written by believers from the beginning, celebrate Christ the Word of God as God! How then are they not ashamed to spread a false report concerning Victor, knowing with certainty that Victor excommunicated Theodotus, the author and father of this *God-denying apostasy!*” The following remarks of our earliest Ecclesiastical Historian reminds us of the writings of Belsham, and the “*Improved Version of the New Testament by a Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge:*” “Without fear they corrupted the Divine Scriptures, and rejected the Canon of the ancient Faith; they search not what the Divine Scriptures say, but laboriously exercise themselves to find some figure of a syllogism for the establishment of their Atheism.”

enabled to fulfil all the offices of a Saviour; which, unless he were *the only-begotten Son of God*, he could be only in name. Happy are those now, who not only acknowledge him as their *Prophet*, but rely upon him as *their Priest*, and study to obey him as *their King*; and happier far shall they be hereafter, when permitted to *see him as he is^y, coming in like manner as* his Apostles *saw him go into heaven*. All who have *received the truth in the love of it* are satisfied, that it is impossible to *stand in judgment with* the just and holy and heart-searching God; and such will thankfully rejoice, that Jesus, having offered himself upon the cross a willing sacrifice to reconcile God to man and man to God, is now ever interceding in heaven, where he is set down upon his Father's throne, which through his intercession has become *a throne of grace*. Upon that throne he now reigns over angels as well as men; and having been *obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross*, his Father *gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church*, and not only to that his *body*, but to all its members who *are builded together in him for an habitation of God*; for when *he ascended up on high*, he obtained for them, individually as well as collectively, the gift of the Holy Spirit, to enlighten their understandings, and to purify their hearts. “^z Grant, we beseech thee, Almighty God, that like as we do believe thy only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ to have ascended into the heavens; so we all may also in heart and mind thither ascend;” for we renounced, when baptized into his religion, “*the pomps and vanity of the world,*” and hope, *our life being hid with Christ in God*, that, *when Christ who is our life shall appear*, we may then *also appear with him in glory!*

^y 1 John iii. 2.

^z Collect for Ascension-day.

THE END.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

A9743
v.2

School of Theology,
at Claremont

By the same Author.

**LECTURES ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE
EPISTLES, 8vo. 6s.**

**LECTURES ON THE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND, 8vo. 7s. 6d.**

**OBSERVATIONS ON THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S
SUPPER, Fourth Edition, 12mo. 2s. 6d.**

A List of Books

RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY

JOHN HENRY AND JAMES PARKER,
OXFORD, AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

NEW THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

REV. JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD.

TRACTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN SEASONS. Third Series.

Edited by the Rev. JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD, M.A., Vicar of Kempsford, Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. 4 vols. Foolscap 8vo., cloth, 14s.

Vol. I.—Advent to Fifth Sunday in Lent. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Vol. II.—Sunday next before Easter to Sixth Sunday after Trinity. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Vol. III.—Seventh Sunday after Trinity to Sunday next before Advent. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Vol. IV.—Holydays. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

OXFORD LENTEN SERMONS.

SERMONS preached at the Churches of ST. MARY-THE-VIRGIN and ST. GILES on the Wednesdays and Fridays during LENT, 1865. *General Subject:* "The enduring Conflict of Christ with the Sin that is in the World."

[*In the Press.*]

THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD: SECOND SERIES, from MDCCCXLVII. to MDCCCLXII. 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

THE ORDINATION SERVICE. ADDRESSES ON THE QUESTIONS TO THE CANDIDATES FOR ORDINATION. By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD. *Fourth Edition.* Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

REV. M. J. FULLER.

THE COURT OF FINAL APPEAL; or, THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE CROWN IN ECCLESIASTICAL CASES. By the Rev. MORRIS J. FULLER, M.A., Incumbent of Prince Town, Dartmoor. Post 8vo., limp cloth, 5s.

[*Ready.*]

REV. H. H. SWINNY.

SERMONS ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS. By the late Rev. HENRY HUTCHINSON SWINNY, M.A., Vicar of Cuddesdon, and Principal of the Theological College; sometime Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. With a Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD. Crown 8vo., cloth, 5s.

[*In a few days.*]

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

DANIEL THE PROPHET. Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. *Third Thousand.* 8vo., cloth, 12s.

THE MINOR PROPHETS; with a Commentary Explanatory and Practical, and Introductions to the Several Books. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. 4to., sewed. 5s. each part.

Part I. contains HOSEA—JOEL, INTRODUCTION.	Part III. AMOS vi. 6 to MICAH i. 12.
Part II. JOEL, INTRODUCTION—AMOS vi. 6.	Part IV. <i>nearly ready.</i>

THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH, from the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 51, to the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; chiefly as to their Constitution, but also as to their Objects and History. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew; Canon of Christ Church; late Fellow of Oriel College. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

REV. ISAAC WILLIAMS.

THE BAPTISTERY, OR THE WAY OF ETERNAL LIFE. By the Author of “The Cathedral.” With Thirty-four Plates from BOETIUS A BOLSWEERT. A new Edition, revised by the Author. 2 vols., Large Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 14s.

REV. JOHN KEBLE.

THE LIFE OF THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD, THOMAS WILSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. Compiled, chiefly from Original Documents, by the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley. In Two Parts, 8vo., price 21s.

REV. G. B. HOWARD.

THE CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS AND THEIR LITURGIES: comprising the Anaphoræ of St. James; St. Peter; The Twelve Apostles; Mar Dionysius; Mar Xystus; and Mar Evannis; together with the Ordo Communis. Translated from Syriac MSS. obtained in Travancore. By the Rev. GEORGE BROADLEY HOWARD, B.A., late Assistant Chaplain in the Diocese of Madras. Post 8vo., cloth, price 10s.

REV. R. W. NORMAN.

SERMONS PREACHED IN THE CHAPEL OF ST. PETER'S COLLEGE, RADLEY. By the Rev. R. W. NORMAN, M.A., Warden. Post 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.

REV. C. A. HEURTLEY, D.D.

THE FORM OF SOUND WORDS: HELPS TOWARDS HOLDING IT FAST: Seven Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, on some Important Points of Faith and Practice.

HINDRANCES TO SUCCESS IN PREACHING.

THE FORM OF SOUND WORDS.

THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN BAPTISM AND

SANCTIFICATION.

CONFESSiON AND ABSOLUTION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

THE LORD'S DAY.

By CHARLES A. HEURTLEY, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church. 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.**THE SALT OF THE EARTH. GOD SITTING AS A REFINER.**

Two Sermons preached at Ordinations of the Lord Bishop of Oxford. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin and Bishop of Kildare, and late Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford. Fcap. 8vo., limp cloth, price 1s. 6d.

REV. P. FREEMAN.

THE PRINCIPLES OF DIVINE SERVICE; or, An Inquiry concerning the True Manner of Understanding and Using the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church. By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A., Vicar of Thorverton, Prebendary of Exeter, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Exeter. 2 vols., 8vo., cloth, price 1l. 4s. *The Second Edition of Vol. I. is now ready.*

For those who have Vol. I. the price of Vol. II., with Introduction, will be 14s.; without the Introduction, 8s.

REV. DR. MOBERLY.

SERMONS ON THE BEATITUDES, with others mostly preached before the University of Oxford; to which is added a Preface relating to the recent volume of "Essays and Reviews." By the Rev. GEORGE MOBERLY, D.C.L., Head Master of Winchester College. *Second Edition.* 8vo., price 10s. 6d.

The Preface separately, price 2s.

REV. J. W. BURGON.

INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION. Seven Sermons preached before the University of Oxford; with an Introduction, being an answer to a Volume entitled "Essays and Reviews." By the Rev. JOHN W. BURGON, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, and Select Preacher. 8vo., cloth, 14s.

REV. WILLIAM BRIGHT.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH, from the EDICT of MILAN, A.D. 313, to the COUNCIL of CHALCEDON, A.D. 451. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford; late Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Scottish Church. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo., price 10s. 6d.

ANCIENT COLLECTS. *Vide p. 7.*

REV. W. H. KARSLAKE.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER, Devotional, Doctrinal, and Practical; with Four Preliminary Dissertations, and an Appendix of Extracts from Writers on the Prayer for Daily Use. By the Rev. W. H. KARSLAKE, Fellow and sometime Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

THE CATENA AUREA.

THE CATENA AUREA. A Commentary on the Four Gospels, collected out of the Works of the Fathers by S. THOMAS AQUINAS. Uniform with the Library of the Fathers. Complete in 7 vols., cloth, price £2 2s.

The First Volume having been reprinted, a few complete Sets may now be had.

REV. W. C. DOWDING.

GERMAN THEOLOGY DURING THE THIRTY-YEARS' WAR. —THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF GEORGE CALIXTUS, Lutheran Abbot of Königslutter, and Professor Primarius in the University of Helmstadt. By the Rev. W. C. DOWDING, M.A., Honorary Secretary to the Berkeley (Bermuda) College Committee; and formerly Incumbent of Llangrove, Herefordshire. Post 8vo., cloth, price 8s. 6d.

REV. T. LATHBURY.

A HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, AND OTHER AUTHORIZED BOOKS, from the Reformation; and an Attempt to ascertain how the Rubrics, Canons, and Customs of the Church have been understood and observed from the same time: with an Account of the State of Religion in England from 1640 to 1660. By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A., Author of "A History of the Convocation," &c. *Second Edition.* 8vo., 10s. 6d.

THE LATE REV. H. NEWLAND.

A NEW CATENA ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.—A PRACTICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS, AND THE PHILIPPIANS: in which are exhibited the Results of the most learned Theological Criticisms, from the Age of the Early Fathers down to the Present Time. Edited by the late Rev. HENRY NEWLAND, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Church, Devon, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter. 8vo., cl., 12s.

REV. H. DOWNING.

SHORT NOTES ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, intended for the Use of Teachers in Parish Schools, and other Readers of the English Version. By HENRY DOWNING, M.A., Incumbent of St. Mary's, Kingswinford. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

SHORT NOTES ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, intended for the use of Teachers in Parish Schools, and other Readers of the English Version. By the same Author. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s.

REV. L. P. MERCIER.

CONSIDERATIONS RESPECTING A FUTURE STATE. By the Rev. LEWIS P. MERCIER, M.A., University College, Oxford. Fcap. 8vo., 4s.

REV. J. M. NEALE.

A HISTORY OF THE SO-CALLED JANSENIST CHURCH OF HOLLAND; with a Sketch of its Earlier Annals, and some Account of the Brothers of the Common Life. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., Warden of Sackville College. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

DR. ELVEY.

THE PSALTER, or Canticles and Psalms of David, Pointed for Chanting, upon a New Principle; with Explanations and Directions. By the late STEPHEN ELVEY, Mus. Doc., Organist and Choragus to the University of Oxford. *Third Edition*, 8vo., cloth, price 5s.

ARCHDEACON CHURTON.

A MEMOIR OF THE LATE JOSHUA WATSON, Esq. By the Venerable Archdeacon CHURTON. *A new and cheaper Edition, with Portrait.* Crown 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

SERMONS, &c.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. From Advent to Whitsuntide. Vol. I. *Fifth Edition.* 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d. Vol. II. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d. [Just published.]

ILLUSTRATIONS OF FAITH. EIGHT PLAIN SERMONS, by a Writer in the "Tracts for the Christian Seasons:"—Abel; Enoch; Noah; Abraham; Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph; Moses; The Walls of Jericho; Conclusions. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

Uniform, and by the same Author,

PLAIN SERMONS ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s. **LECTION OF OUR LORD.** 2 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 10s.

HISTORICAL AND PRACTICAL SERMONS ON THE SUFFERINGS AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 4s. **SERMONS ON NEW TESTAMENT CHARACTERS.** Fcap. 8vo., 4s.

CHRISTIAN SEASONS.—Short and Plain Sermons for every Sunday and Holyday throughout the Year. Edited by the late Bishop of Grahamstown. 4 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 16s.

— A Second Series of Sermons for the Christian Seasons. Uniform with the above. 4 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 16s.

ARMSTRONG'S PAROCHIAL SERMONS. Parochial Sermons, by JOHN ARMSTRONG, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Grahamstown. A New Edition. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

ARMSTRONG'S SERMONS FOR FASTS AND FESTIVALS. A new Edition. Fcap. 8vo., 5s.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS, by the Rev. HENRY W. BURROWS, B.D., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, St. Pancras. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

— Second Series. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

THE WITNESS OF GOD: FIVE SERMONS preached before the University of Oxford. By THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, M.A., Exeter College; Rector of Walcot; one of the Select Preachers for 1855-6, and 1862-3; and Bampton Lecturer for 1864. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s.

SERMONS preached before the University of Oxford, and in Winchester Cathedral, by the late DAVID WILLIAMS, D.C.L., Warden of New College, Oxford, and Canon of Winchester; formerly Head Master of Winchester College. **WITH A BRIEF MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR.** 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

THE AUTHENTICITY AND MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF THE PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH vindicated in a Course of Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, by the Rev. R. PAYNE SMITH, M.A., Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, and Select Preacher. 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

SHORT SERMONS FOR FAMILY READING. Ninety Short Sermons for Family Reading, following the course of the Christian Seasons. By the Author of "A Plain Commentary on the Gospels." 2 vols., cloth, 8s.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, and in other places. By the late Rev. C. MARRIOTT, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 12mo., cloth, 6s.

— Volume the Second. 12mo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

Works of the Standard English Divines,
PUBLISHED IN THE LIBRARY OF ANGLO-CATHOLIC THEOLOGY,

AT THE FOLLOWING PRICES IN CLOTH.

- ANDREWES' (BP.) COMPLETE WORKS. 11 vols., 8vo., £3 7s.
 THE SERMONS. (Separate.) 5 vols., £1 15s.
- BEVERIDGE'S (BP.) COMPLETE WORKS. 12 vols., 8vo., £4 4s.
 THE ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 10 vols., £3 10s.
- BRAMHALL'S (ABP.) WORKS, WITH LIFE AND LETTERS, &c.
 5 vols., 8vo., £1 15s.
- BULL'S (BP.) HARMONY ON JUSTIFICATION. 2 vols., 8vo., 10s.
 _____ DEFENCE OF THE NICENE CREED. 2 vols., 10s.
 _____ JUDGMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. 5s.
- COSIN'S (BP.) WORKS COMPLETE. 5 vols., 8vo., £1 10s.
- CRAKANTHORP'S DEFENSIO ECCLESÆ ANGLICANÆ.
 8vo., 7s.
- FRANK'S SERMONS. 2 vols., 8vo., 10s.
- FORBES' CONSIDERATIONES MODESTÆ. 2 vols., 8vo., 12s.
- GUNNING'S PASCHAL, OR LENT FAST. 8vo., 6s.
- HAMMOND'S PRACTICAL CATECHISM. 8vo., 5s.
 _____ MISCELLANEOUS THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 5s.
 _____ THIRTY-ONE SERMONS. 2 Parts. 10s.
- HICKES'S TWO TREATISES ON THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD. 3 vols., 8vo., 15s.
- JOHNSON'S (JOHN) THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 2 vols., 8vo., 10s.
 _____ ENGLISH CANONS. 2 vols., 12s.
- LAUD'S (ABP.) COMPLETE WORKS. 6 vols., (8 Parts,) 8vo.
 £2 10s.
- L'ESTRANGE'S ALLIANCE OF DIVINE OFFICES. 8vo., 6s.
- MARSHALL'S PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE. 8vo., 4s.
- NICHOLSON'S (BP.) EXPOSITION OF THE CATECHISM. (This volume cannot be sold separate from the complete set.)
- OVERALL'S (BP.) CONVOCATION-BOOK OF 1606. 8vo., 5s.
- PEARSON'S (BP.) VINDICLÆ EPISTOLARUM S. IGNATII.
 2 vols. 8vo., 10s.
- THORNDIKE'S (HERBERT) THEOLOGICAL WORKS COMPLETE. 6 vols., (10 Parts,) 8vo., £2 10s.
- WILSON'S (BP.) WORKS COMPLETE. With LIFE, by Rev. J. KEBLE. 7 vols., (8 Parts,) 8vo., £3 3s.

A complete set, £25.

DAILY STEPS TOWARDS HEAVEN; or, Practical Thoughts on the Gospel History, and especially on the Life and Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, for every day in the year, according to the Christian Seasons. With Titles and Characters of Christ; and a Harmony of the Four Gospels. *Eleventh Edition.* 32mo., roan, 2s. 6d.; morocco, 4s. 6d.

— **LARGE-TYPE EDITION**, square crown 8vo., cloth, price 5s.

GOLDEN WORDS. The Rich and Precious Jewel of God's Holy Word. Prayer. The Lord's Supper. Christ Mystical. The Sabbath. Public Worship. The Art of Hearing. Walking with God. Faith. Repentance. And Passages on Miscellaneous Subjects. Fcap. 8vo., printed in antique type, on toned paper, cloth gilt, price 7s. 6d.; morocco, 12s. 6d.

THE PASTOR IN HIS CLOSET; or, A Help to the Devotions of the Clergy. By JOHN ARMSTRONG, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Grahamstown. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s.

DAILY SERVICES FOR CHRISTIAN HOUSEHOLDS, compiled and arranged by the Rev. H. STOBART, M.A. 18mo., paper, 1s.; cloth, 1s. 4d.

THOUGHTS DURING SICKNESS. By the Author of "The Doctrine of the Cross," and "Devotions for the Sick Room." *Second Edition.* Price 2s. 6d.

BREVIAVES FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE, arranged for use by the Bed of Sickness. By the Rev. G. ARDEN, M.A., Rector of Winterborne-Came; Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Devon; Author of "A Manual of Catechetical Instruction." Fcap. 8vo. *Second Edition.* 2s.

THE CURE OF SOULS. By the Rev. G. ARDEN, M.A. Fcap. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

PRECES PRIVATÆ in studiosorum gratiam collectæ et regia auctoritate approbatæ: anno MDLXVIII. *Londini editæ:* ad vetera exemplaria denuo recognitæ. Ed. C. MARRIOTT. 16mo., cloth, 6s.

OXFORD SERIES OF DEVOTIONAL WORKS. Fcap. 8vo.

The Imitation of Christ.

FOUR BOOKS. By Thomas A KEMPIS. Cl., 5s.; antique calf, red edges, 10s. 6d.

Laud's Devotions.

THE PRIVATE DEVOTIONS of DR. WILLIAM LAUD, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Martyr. Antique cloth, 5s.

Wilson's Sacra Privata.

THE PRIVATE MEDITATIONS, DEVOTIONS, and PRAYERS of the Right Rev. T. WILSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. Now first printed entire. Cl., 6s.

Andrewes' Devotions.

DEVOTIONS. By the Right Rev. Father in God, LAUNCELOT ANDREWES. Translated from the Greek and Latin, and arranged anew. Cloth, 5s.; morocco, 8s.; antique calf, red edges, 10s. 6d.

Spinckes' Devotions.

TRUE CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN'S COMPANION IN THE CLOSET; or, a complete Manual of Private Devotions, collected from the Writings of eminent Divines of the Church of England. Floriated borders, cloth, antique, 4s.

Taylor's Holy Living.

THE RULE AND EXERCISES OF HOLY LIVING. By BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. In antique cloth binding, 4s.

Taylor's Holy Dying.

THE RULE AND EXERCISES OF HOLY DYING. By BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. In antique cloth binding, 4s.

Taylor's Golden Grove.

THE GOLDEN GROVE; a Choice Manual, containing what is to be Believed, Practised, and Desired, or Prayed for. By BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. Printed on toned paper with red lines, uniform with "Holy Living and Holy Dying." In antique cloth binding, 3s. 6d.

Ancient Collects.

ANCIENT COLLECTS AND OTHER PRAYERS, Selected for Devotional Use from various Rituals, with an Appendix on the Collects in the Prayer-book. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford, Author of "A History of the Church," &c. *Third Edition.* In antique cloth binding, 5s.

THE AUTHOR OF "THE CHRISTIAN YEAR."

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year. *Octavo Edition*,—Large type, cloth, 10s. 6d.; morocco by Hayday, 21s.; antique calf, 18s. *Foolscap Octavo Edition*,—Cloth, 7s. 6d.; morocco, 10s. 6d.; morocco by Hayday, 15s.; antique calf, 12s. *32mo. Edition*,—Cloth, 3s. 6d.; morocco, plain, 5s.; morocco by Hayday, 7s. *Cheap Edition*,—Cloth, 1s. 6d.; bound, 2s.

LYRA INNOCENTIUM. Thoughts in Verse for Christian Children. *Foolscap Octavo Edition*,—Cloth, 7s. 6d.; morocco, plain, 10s. 6d.; morocco by Hayday, 15s.; antique calf, 12s. *18mo. Edition*,—Cloth, 6s.; morocco, 8s. 6d. *32mo. Edition*,—Cloth, 3s. 6d.; morocco, plain, 5s.; morocco by Hayday, 7s. *Cheap Edition*,—Cloth, 1s. 6d.; bound, 2s.

THE AUTHOR OF "THE CATHEDRAL."

THE CATHEDRAL. Foolscap 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.; 32mo., with Engravings, 4s. 6d.

THOUGHTS IN PAST YEARS. *The Sixth Edition*, with several new Poems, 32mo., cloth, 4s. 6d.

THE BAPTISTERY; or, The Way of Eternal Life. 32mo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

The above Three Volumes uniform, 32mo., neatly bound in morocco, 18s.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR. Foolscap 8vo., 10s. 6d.; 32mo., cloth, 4s. 6d.

THE SEVEN DAYS; or, The Old and New Creation. *Second Edition*, Foolscap 8vo., 7s. 6d.

MORNING THOUGHTS. By a CLERGYMAN. Suggested by the Second Lessons for the Daily Morning Service throughout the year. 2 vols. Foolscap 8vo., cloth, 5s. each.

THE CHILD'S CHRISTIAN YEAR. Hymns for every Sunday and Holyday throughout the year. *Cheap Edition*, 18mo., cloth, 1s.

COXE'S CHRISTIAN BALLADS. Foolscap 8vo., cloth, 3s. Also selected Poems in a packet, sewed, 1s.

FLORUM SACRA. By the Rev. G. HUNT SMYTTAN. *Second Edition*, 16mo., 1s.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH.

IRISH HISTORY AND IRISH CHARACTER. By GOLDWIN SMITH. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo., price 5s.

Uniform with the above.

THE EMPIRE. A SERIES OF LETTERS PUBLISHED IN "THE DAILY NEWS," 1862, 1863. By GOLDWIN SMITH. Post 8vo., cloth, price 6s.

DR. DAUBENY.

CLIMATE: AN INQUIRY INTO THE CAUSES OF ITS DIFFERENCES, AND INTO ITS INFLUENCE ON VEGETABLE LIFE. Comprising the substance of Four Lectures delivered before the Natural History Society, at the Museum, Torquay, in February, 1863. By C. DAUBENY, M.D., F.R.S., Professor of Botany and of Rural Economy in the University of Oxford, &c., &c. 8vo., cloth, price 4s.

LECTURES ON ROMAN HUSBANDRY, delivered before the University of Oxford; comprehending an Account of the System of Agriculture, the Treatment of Domestic Animals, the Horticulture, &c., pursued in Ancient Times. 8vo., cloth, reduced to 6s.

FOUR LECTURES ON THE TREES AND SHRUBS OF THE ANCIENTS.

[*In the Press.*]

CHARLES ELTON.

NORWAY: THE ROAD AND THE FELL. By CHARLES ELTON, late Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. Post 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.

COLONEL SMYTHE.

TEN MONTHS IN THE FIJI ISLANDS. By MRS. SMYTHE. With an Introduction and Appendix by Colonel W. J. SMYTHE, Royal Artillery; late H.M.'s Commissioner to those Islands. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo., cloth, 15s.

WILLIAM BURGES.

ART APPLIED TO INDUSTRY: a Series of Lectures by WILLIAM BURGES, F.R.I.B.A. Medium 8vo., cloth, 4s. [Just ready.]

EARLY HISTORY.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, from its first Establishment to the End of the Anglo-Saxon Period. Addressed to the Young. Fcap. 8vo. [Just ready.]

PRAYER-BOOK.

THE CALENDAR OF THE PRAYER-BOOK ILLUSTRATED. (Comprising the first portion of the "Calendar of the Anglican Church," illustrated, enlarged, and corrected.) With upwards of Sixty Engravings from Medieval Works of Art. *In the press.*

M. VIOLET-LE-DUC.

THE MILITARY ARCHITECTURE OF THE MIDDLE AGES, Translated from the French of M. VIOLET-LE-DUC. By M. MACDERMOTT, Esq., Architect. With the 151 original French Engravings. Medium 8vo., cloth, price £1 1s.

HISTORICAL TALES, illustrating the chief events in Ecclesiastical History, British and Foreign, adapted for General Reading, Parochial Libraries, &c. In Monthly Volumes, with a Frontispiece, price 1s.

Already published.

- | | |
|---|--|
| No. 1.—THE CAVE IN THE HILLS. | No. 15.—THE BRIDE OF RAMCUTTAH. |
| No. 2.—THE EXILES OF THE CEBENNA. | No. 16.—ALICE OF FOBING. |
| No. 3.—THE CHIEF'S DAUGHTER. | No. 17.—THE NORTHERN LIGHT. |
| No. 4.—THE LILY OF TIFLIS. | No. 18.—AUBREY DE L'ORNE. |
| No. 5.—WILD SCENES AMONGST THE CELTS. | No. 19.—LUCIA'S MARRIAGE. |
| No. 6.—THE LAZAR-HOUSE OF LEROS. | No. 20.—WOLFINGHAM. |
| No. 7.—THE RIVALS. | No. 21.—THE FORSAKEN. |
| No. 8.—THE CONVERT OF MASSACHUSETTS. | No. 22.—THE DOVE OF TABENNA.—
THE RESCUE. |
| No. 9.—THE QUAY OF THE DIOSCURI. | No. 23.—LARACHE. |
| No. 10.—THE BLACK DANES. | No. 24.—WALTER THE ARMOURER. |
| No. 11.—THE CONVERSION OF ST. VLADIMIR. | No. 25.—THE CATECHUMENS OF THE COROMANDEL COAST. |
| No. 12.—THE SEA-TIGERS. | No. 26.—THE DAUGHTERS OF POLA. |
| No. 13.—THE CROSS IN SWEDEN. | No. 27.—AGNES MARTIN. |
| No. 14.—THE ALLELUIA BATTLE. | No. 28.—ROSE AND MINNIE. |
| | No. 29.—DORES DE GUALDIM. |

ALICE LISLE: A Tale of Puritan Times. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE SCHOLAR AND THE TROOPER; OR, OXFORD DURING THE GREAT REBELLION. By the Rev. W. E. HEYGATE. *Cheap Edition.* Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

SOME YEARS AFTER: A Tale. Fcap. 8vo., cloth lettered, 7s.

FOR LIFE: A Story, in Two Parts. By LOUIS SAND. Post 8vo., cloth, price 6s.

ATHELINE; OR, THE CASTLE BY THE SEA. A Tale. By LOUISA STEWART, Author of "Walks at Templecombe," "Floating away," &c. 2 vols., Fcap. 8vo. 9s.

MIGNONETTE: A SKETCH. By the Author of "The Curate of Holy Cross." 2 vols., Fcap., cloth, 10s.

THE CALIFORNIAN CRUSOE: A Tale of Mormonism. By the Rev. H. CASWALL, Vicar of Figheldean. Fcap. 8vo., with Illustration, cloth, 2s. 6d.

STORM AND SUNSHINE; OR, THE BOYHOOD OF HERBERT FALCONER. A Tale. By W. E. DICKSON, M.A., Author of "Our Workshop," &c. With Frontispiece, cloth, 2s.

CHARLES WINSTON.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE DIFFERENCE OF STYLE OBSERVABLE IN ANCIENT GLASS PAINTINGS, especially in England, with Hints on Glass Painting, by the late CHARLES WINSTON. With Corrections and Additions by the Author, and a Series of his Letters describing improved Methods of Manufacturing and Colouring Glass for Painted Windows. *A New Edition in the Press.*

DOMESDAY BOOK.

DOMESDAY BOOK, or the Great Survey of England of William the Conqueror, A.D. M^{DC}LXXXVI. Facsimile of the part relating to Oxfordshire. Folio, cloth, 8s.

This is an exact facsimile taken by means of Photography. The process is named by Sir Henry James,—Photozincography. The actual MS. of the Domesday Survey was by permission taken to the Ordnance Office at Southampton, where under the general superintendence of the Director of the Ordnance Survey the photograph was taken and transferred to zinc, from which the copies are printed. Thus the slightest mark in the original occurs in this facsimile.

DOMESDAY BOOK, or the Great Survey of England of William the Conqueror, A.D. M^{DC}LXXXVI. A literal translation of the Part relating to Oxfordshire, with Introduction, &c. *In the press.*

REV. JOHN PUCKLE.

THE CHURCH AND FORTRESS OF DOVER CASTLE. By the Rev. JOHN PUCKLE, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Dover; Rural Dean. With Illustrations from the Author's Drawings. Medium 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.

JOHN HENRY PARKER.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. By JOHN HENRY PARKER, F.S.A. *Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged,* with 170 Illustrations, and a Glossarial Index. Fcap. 8vo., cloth lettered, price 5s.

AN ATTEMPT TO DISCRIMINATE THE STYLES OF ARCHITECTURE IN ENGLAND, FROM THE CONQUEST TO THE REFORMATION: WITH A SKETCH OF THE GRECIAN AND ROMAN ORDERS. By the late THOMAS RICKMAN, F.S.A. Sixth Edition, with considerable Additions, chiefly Historical, by JOHN HENRY PARKER, F.S.A., and numerous Illustrations by O. Jewitt. 8vo., cloth, price 1l. 1s.

JOHN HEWITT.

ANCIENT ARMOUR AND WEAPONS IN EUROPE. By JOHN HEWITT, Member of the Archæological Institute of Great Britain. Vols. II. and III., comprising the Period from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century, completing the work, 1l. 12s. Also Vol. I., from the Iron Period of the Northern Nations to the end of the Thirteenth Century, 18s. The work complete, 3 vols., 8vo., 2l. 10s.

EDITOR OF GLOSSARY.

SOME ACCOUNT OF DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE IN ENGLAND, from Richard II. to Henry VIII. (or the Perpendicular Style). With Numerous Illustrations of Existing Remains from Original Drawings. By the EDITOR OF "THE GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURE." In 2 vols., 8vo., 1l. 10s.

Also,

VOL. I.—FROM WILLIAM I. TO EDWARD I. (or the Norman and Early English Styles). 8vo., 2ls.

VOL. II.—FROM EDWARD I. TO RICHARD II. (the Edwardian Period, or the Decorated Style). 8vo., 2ls.

*The work complete, with 400 Engravings, and a General Index,
4 vols. 8vo., price £3 12s.*

Very Rev. H. H. Milman.

Hebrew Prophecy. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, March 26, 1865. By the Very Rev. H. H. MILMAN, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. 8vo., sewed, 1s.

The Lord Bishop of Oxford.

The Voice of the Lord. A Sermon preached on the Occasion of the Re-opening of the Chapel of Worcester College, Oxford. Crown 8vo., 6d.

Fellowship in Joy and Sorrow. A Sermon preached in Her Majesty's Royal Chapel in Windsor Castle, on the Sunday preceding the Marriage of H. R. H. the PRINCE OF WALES, March 8, 1863. (Published by Her Majesty's command.) 8vo., 6d.

Commemorations of the Departed. A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Chapel at Wellington College, July 16, 1863. 8vo., 6d.

Very Rev. the Dean of Westminster.

Human Corruption. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sexagesima Sunday, Feb. 8, 1863. 8vo., 1s.

Great Opportunities. A Farewell Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, in Christ Church Cathedral, on Advent Sunday, Nov. 29, 1863. 8vo., 1s.

A Reasonable, Holy, and Living Sacrifice. A Sermon preached by ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster, in Westminster Abbey, on Jan. 10, 1864, being the day following his Installation. 8vo., 1s.

The Encouragements of Ordination.

A Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Lord Bishop of London, in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Trinity Sunday, May 22, 1864. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. (Published at the request of the Bishop.) 8vo., 1s.

Rev. John Keble.

Pentecostal Fear. A Sermon preached in the Parish Church, Cuddesdon, on Tuesday, May 24, 1864, on the Anniversary of the Theological College. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley, in the Diocese of Winchester. (Published by request.) 8vo., 1s.

Women labouring in the Lord. A Sermon preached at Wantage, on St. Mary Magdalene's Day, July 22, 1863. (Published by request.) Fcap. 8vo., 6d.

Rev. W. C. Lake.

The Inspiration of Scripture, and Eternal Punishment. Two Sermons preached in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, with a Preface on the "Oxford Declaration," and on Mr. Maurice's Letter to the Bishop of London. By WILLIAM CHARLES LAKE, M.A., Rector of Huntspill; Prebendary of Wells; and Preacher at the Chapel Royal of Whitehall. Post 8vo., sewed, price 2s.

Rev. Dr. Moberly.

The Unity of the Saints the Evidence of the Gospel. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on All Saints' Day, 1863. 8vo., 1s.

Rev. H. L. Mansel.

The Witness of the Church to the Promise of Christ's Coming. A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Bishops of Peterborough, of Tasmania, and of the Niger. By H. L. MANSEL, B.D., Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy. 8vo., in wrapper, price 1s.

Rev. G. W. Kitchin.

On a Right Judgment. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, Jan. 17, 1864. (Published by request.) 8vo., 6d.

The Court of Appeal. A Sermon preached before Sir John Barnard Byles, one of the Justices of the Court of Common Pleas, and the University of Oxford, at the Winter Assize, Dec. 18, 1864.

THE FIFTH BOOK OF EUCLID.—The Propositions of the Fifth Book of Euclid proved Algebraically: with an Introduction, Notes, and Questions. By GEORGE STURTON WARD, M.A., Mathematical Lecturer in Magdalen Hall, and Public Examiner in the University of Oxford. Crown 8vo., price 2s. 6d.

H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. The Greek Testament with English Notes. By the Rev. EDWARD BURTON, D.D., sometime Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. *Sixth Edition, with Index.* 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

PASS AND CLASS. An Oxford Guide-Book through the Courses of *Literæ Humaniores*, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Law and Modern History. By MONTAGU BURROWS, M.A. *Second Edition, with some of the latest Examination Papers.* Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

ANNALS OF ENGLAND. An Epitome of English History. From Contemporary Writers, the Rolls of Parliament, and other Public Records. 3 vols. Feap. 8vo., with Illustrations, cloth, 15s. *Recommended by the Examiners in the School of Modern History at Oxford.*

Vol. I. From the Roman Era to the Death of Richard II. Cloth, 5s.

Vol. II. From the Accession of the House of Lancaster to Charles I. Cloth, 5s.

Vol. III. From the Commonwealth to the Death of Queen Anne. Cloth, 5s.

Each Volume is sold separately.

GRAMMARS.

JELF'S GREEK GRAMMAR.—A Grammar of the Greek Language, chiefly from the text of Raphael Kühner. By WM. EDW. JELF, M.A., Student of Ch. Ch. *Third Edition, greatly improved.* 2 vols. 8vo., 17. 10s.

This Grammar is in general use at Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, and Durham; at Eton, King's College, London, and most other public schools.

MADVIG'S LATIN GRAMMAR. A Latin Grammar for the Use of Schools. By Professor MADVIG, with additions by the Author. Translated by the Rev. G. Woods, M.A. Uniform with JELF'S "Greek Grammar." *Fourth Edition.* 8vo., cloth, 12s.

Competent authorities pronounce this work to be the very best Latin Grammar yet published in England. This new Edition contains an Index to the Authors quoted.

LAWS OF THE GREEK ACCENTS. By JOHN GRIFFITHS, M.A. 16mo. *Twelfth Edition.* Price Sixpence.

OCTAVO EDITIONS OF CLASSICS.

THUCYDIDES, with Notes, chiefly Historical and Geographical. By the late T. ARNOLD, D.D. With Indices by the Rev. R. P. G. TIDDEMAN. *Fifth Edition.* 3 vols., 8vo., cloth lettered, £1 16s.

THE ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE. With Notes by the Rev. W. E. JELF, B.D., Author of "A Greek Grammar," &c. 8vo., cloth, 12s.

The Text separately, 5s. The Notes separately, 7s. 6d.

SOPHOCLIS TRAGOËDIAE, with Notes, adapted to the use of Schools and Universities. By THOMAS MITCHELL, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo., £1 8s.

The following Plays may also be had separately, at 5s. each:—

ŒDIPUS COLONEUS.
ELECTRA.

AJAX.
TRACHINIAE.

ANTIGONE.
PHILOCTETES.

**A SERIES OF GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS
FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS.**

GREEK AUTHORS.

							Paper.	Bound.
							s. d.	s. d.
Æschylus	2	6
Aristophanes.	2 vols.	5	0
Euripides.	3 vols.	5	0
—	Tragœdiæ Sex	3	0
Sophocles	2	6
Homeri Ilias	3	0
—	Odyssea	2	6

LATIN AUTHORS.

Horatius	1	6
Juvenalis et Persius	1	0
Lucanus	2	0
Lucretius	1	6
Phædrus	1	0
Virgiliius	2	0

Cæsaris Commentarii, cum Supplementis Auli Hirtii et aliorum	2	0	...	2	6
— Commentarii de Bello Gallico	1	0
Cicero De Officiis, de Senectute, et de Amicitia	1	6
Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri V.	1	6

— Orationes Selectæ, *in the press*

Cornelius Nepos	1	0
Livius. 4 vols.	5	0
Sallustius	1	6
Tacitus. 2 vols.	4	0

*Pocket Editions of the following have been published
with Short Notes.*

SOPHOCLES.

	s. d.		s. d.
AJAX (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	. . 1 0	ANTIGONE (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	. 1 0
ELECTRA "	. . 1 0	PHILOCTETES "	. . 1 0
OEDIPUS REX "	. . 1 0	TRACHINIAE "	. . 1 0
OEDIPUS COLONEUS "	. . 1 0		

The Notes only, in one vol., cloth, 3s.

ÆSCHYLUS.

	s. d.		s. d.
PROMETHEUS VINCTUS (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0	AGAMEMNON (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0
SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS , , , , ,	1 0	CHOEPhORÆ , , , , ,	1 0
PERSÆ , , , , ,	1 0	EUMENIDES , , , , ,	1 0

The Notes only, in one vol., cloth, 3s. 6d.

EURIPIDES.

	s. d.		s. d.
HECUBA (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0	HIPPOLYTUS (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0
MEDEA , , , , ,	1 0	PHœNISSÆ , , , , ,	1 0
ORESTES , , , , ,	1 0	ALCESTIS , , , , ,	1 0

The Notes only, in one vol., cloth, 3s.

ARISTOPHANES . . .	THE KNIGHTS (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0
	ACHARNIANS , ,	1 0
	THE BIRDS, <i>in the press.</i>	

DEMOSTHENES . . .	DE CORONA (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	2 0
	OLYNTHIAC ORATIONS, <i>in the press.</i>	

ÆSCHINES . . .	IN CTESIPHONTEM (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	2 0
HOMERUS . . .	ILIAS, LIB. I.—VI. (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	2 0

VIRGILIUS . . .	BUCOLICA (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0
	GEORGICA , ,	2 0
	ÆNEIDOS, LIB. I.—III. , ,	1 0

HORATIUS . . .	CARMINA, &c. (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	2 0
	SATIRÆ , ,	1 0
	EPISTOLÆ ET ARS POETICA , ,	1 0

The Notes only, in one vol., cloth, 2s.

SALLUSTIUS . . .	JUGURTHA (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 6
	CATILINA , ,	1 0

M. T. CICERO . . .	PRO MILONE (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0
	IN CATILINAM , ,	1 0
	PRO LEGE MANILIA, and PRO ARCHIA , , .	1 0
	DE SENECTUTE and DE AMICITIA , , .	1 0

LIVIUS	LIB. XXI.—XXIV. (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	4 0
CÆSAR	LIB. I.—III. (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0
CORNELIUS NEPOS (<i>Text and Notes</i>)		1 6
PHÆDRUS	FABULÆ (<i>Text and Notes</i>)	1 0

Other portions of several of the above-named Authors are in preparation.

Uniform with the Oxford Pocket Classics.

JOHNSON'S LIVES OF THE POETS.

THE LIVES OF THE MOST EMINENT ENGLISH POETS; WITH CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THEIR WORKS. By SAMUEL JOHNSON.—Vol. I. containing Lives of Cowley, Denham, Milton, Butler, Rochester, Roscommon, Otway, Waller, and Dryden. 24mo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Vol. II. just ready. Vol. III., completing the Lives, will be published in due course.

Price 4s.

THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY CALENDAR 1865. Corrected to the end of Michaelmas Term, 1864.

12mo., cloth, price 5s.; black roan, 5s. 6d.

THE OXFORD TEN-YEAR BOOK: A Volume Supplementary to the "Oxford University Calendar." This volume has an Index which shews at once all the academical honours and offices of every person comprised in the lists, which date from the earliest times in the history of the University to the present. The first of these decennial volumes is made up to the end of the year 1860; the second will be issued after the end of 1870. The CALENDAR itself will be published annually as before, and will contain all the Class Lists, and all the names of Officers, Professors, and others, accruing since the date of the preceding TEN-YEAR BOOK.

In one volume, cloth, price 10s.

THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION PAPERS COMPLETE for the Hilary, Easter, and Trinity Terms, 1863. Including those for the several Scholarships as well as those for the Public Examinations.

A few copies of most may still be had separately, as follows:—

Scholarships and Public Examinations, Hilary to Trinity, 1863.

	s. d.		s. d.
1. Hertford	1 0	5. Responsions	<i>Hilary</i> 0 6
2. Senior University Mathematical	0 6	14. Responsions	<i>Trinity</i> 0 6
3. Junior University Mathematical	0 6	9. 1st Public, Lit. Hum.	<i>Easter</i> 1 0
4. Ireland	1 0	12. 1st Public, Math.	<i>ditto</i> 1 0
7. Johnson	1 0	6. 2nd Public, Lit. Hum.	<i>Easter</i> 1 0
13. Taylor	0 6	10. 2nd Public, Math.	<i>ditto</i> 1 0
		11. 2nd Public, Law and Hist.	<i>ditto</i> 1 0
		8. 2nd Public, Nat. Science	<i>ditto</i> 0 6

The above in one volume, price 10s.

Public Examinations, Michaelmas Term, 1863.

	s. d.		s. d.
18. Responsions	<i>Mich.</i> 0 6	19. 2nd Public, Discip. Math.	<i>Mich.</i> 0 6
16. 1st Public, Lit. Græc.	<i>ditto</i> 1 0	20. 2nd Public, Law and Hist.	<i>ditto</i> 1 0
21. 1st Public, Math.	<i>ditto</i> 0 6	17. 2nd Public, Nat. Science	<i>ditto</i> 0 6
15. 2nd Public, Lit. Hum.	<i>ditto</i> 1 0		

Public Examinations, &c., Hilary to Michaelmas, 1864.

	s. d.		s. d.
23. Responsions	<i>Hilary</i> 0 6	36. 2nd Public, Law and Hist.	<i>Mich.</i> 1 0
30. Responsions	<i>Easter</i> 0 6	27. 2nd Public, Math. and Phys.	<i>Easter</i> 1 0
25. 1st Public, Lit. Græc.	<i>ditto</i> 1 0	35. 2nd Public, Math. and Phys.	<i>Mich.</i> 1 0
33. 1st Public, Lit. Græc.	<i>Mich.</i> 1 0	26. 2nd Public, Law and Hist.	<i>Easter</i> 1 0
28. 1st Public, Math.	<i>Easter</i> 1 0	29. 2nd Public, Nat. Science	<i>Easter</i> 1 0
34. 1st Public, Disc. Math.	<i>Mich.</i> 1 0	32. 2nd Public, Nat. Science	<i>Mich.</i> 1 0
24. 2nd Public, Lit. Hum.	<i>Easter</i> 1 0	22. Hertford Scholarship	0 6
31. 2nd Public, Lit. Hum.	<i>Mich.</i> 1 0		

PASS AND CLASS: An Oxford Guide-Book through the Courses of *Literæ Humaniores*, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Law and Modern History. By MONTAGU BURROWS, M.A. Second Edition, with some of the latest Examination Papers. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, price 5s.

OXFORD LOCAL EXAMINATIONS.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. LOCAL EXAMINATIONS. Examination Papers for the year 1864, with Lists of the Delegates and Examiners, and the Regulations and Notices, prefixed. 8vo., sewed, price 2s.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. LOCAL EXAMINATIONS. Seventh Annual Report of the Delegacy, for the year 1864. 8vo., sewed, price 1s. 6d.

345
A 75 89

BS2560 .M2 1865 / vol 2
MacBride, John David, 1778-1868.
Lectures explanatory of the Diatessaron

BS
2560
M2
1865
v.2

A
**THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA**

A9743
v.2

